

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, 28th November 1923.

The House met at 11 o'clock, the President (the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.) in the chair.

I

NEW MEMBERS.

The following Members were sworn in :—

- (1) Mr. BRADFORD LESLIE.
- (2) Mr. J. L. P. ROCHE VICTORIA.

II

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR REGARDING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE MINISTRY.

The House then resumed the discussion on the above motion.

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Mr. President, when the results of the general election were known, I thought that I would generally support the Ministry, but since then circumstances have altered and after what the hon. the Leader of the Party said yesterday in reply to my hon. and learned Friend the Member for the University that political prisoners were dacoits and robbers and deserved to be treated as such, I must say I have considerably altered my views for the simple reason that political prisoners are prisoners because of their conscience. Putting it personally a time may come when I myself may, on a matter of conscience, go to prison. I think it inhuman that a person who is prepared to sacrifice himself for the sake of what he thinks is the interests of his country should be treated as a dacoit. I must enter my emphatic protest against such a sentiment.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Which hon. Member called you a dacoit or robber ? ”

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ I did not say that I was called a dacoit or robber, but I simply said a time might come when as a matter of conscience I might go to prison as a political prisoner and be treated like a dacoit or robber. If it is said that political prisoners should be condemned to the penalties that are due to robbers and dacoits, then I must vote for the motion merely because of such sentiments being expressed by the Leader of the Party.

“ When the Justice Party came into power last time, its leaders, though they had won leadership outside, had still to win it inside the House, and I thought that time would teach them lessons which would go considerably towards giving them the political experience which they needed ; but I find I have been sadly mistaken. Mr. President, in my opinion, all this trouble would not have arisen if it was not for the dual leadership as has existed during the last three years, one man leading the party and another man being the Chief Minister. This experiment was tried in England and proved a failure. During the war, Mr. Lloyd George was the Prime Minister, and Mr. Bonar Law the Leader of the House of Commons, and the

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

[28th November 1923]

fall of the Coalition Ministry was chiefly due to the dual leadership. And if this Ministry is going to fall to-day, it is, I think, owing to the dual leadership—of a leader leading the party and another the Ministry.

“Next, Sir, on what principle, I would like to know, was Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu left out of the Ministry? If the hon. the Chief Minister thought that they had the confidence of this House, then I think it was due to my hon. Friend Sir Kurma that he should have been retained as a Minister. I have not the least objection for the inclusion of my hon. Friend, Mr. Sivagnanam Pillai, for I have the greatest respect for that gentleman. But what I say is that as a matter of principle they ought to have retained my hon. Friend Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu. I have been told—I think he can correct me if I am wrong—that he did not know that he was going to be left out of the Ministry even an hour before the new Ministry was formed. If that is so, I ask the hon. the Chief Minister why a Colleague who had been with him loyally for the last three years and who had been an ardent and loyal member of the Justice Party should have been thrown overboard merely because of a Tamilian revolt. If there was a revolt on the part of one section of the party, I think the hon. the Chief Minister should have told the party that there was such a revolt and consulted his followers as to the course he should adopt. If he had acted in this open manner, or if he had only told my hon. Friend here (Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu) that he felt considerable diffidence about the Ministry continuing in power without a Tamilian in it, then I am sure my hon. Friend will have willingly sacrificed himself at the altar of a party unity.

“Another thing I would like to say is this. If there was anybody here who was loyal to the party, it was my hon. Friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar. He stood loyal to the party throughout, and I would call him with due deference the prize boy of the party. I might compare him to Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Winston Churchill at the end of the general election of 1906, when the Liberals came into power. Fancy a Liberal Cabinet of 1906 without either of them in it! And yet, what was done? He was simply left out merely on the supposition that the Tamilian support might not be obtained if my hon. Friend had a place in the Ministry. It is no good blaming the Governor for the formation of the Ministry. I would say this, that His Excellency has tried to be a constitutional Governor during the whole time he has been in this country (cheers). If there is one man who has tried to follow liberal principles which have been put forward in the Government of India Act, it has been Lord Willingdon. He has tried his best to introduce the principle of the British constitution into this country, and I think to throw this blame on His Excellency just because he assented to the choice of the hon. Mr. Sivagnanam Pillai as his Minister is, to say the least, uncharitable. I do not think that a blame like that can be so easily thrown on His Excellency when he has been acting in the most constitutional manner.

“I would like to say in conclusion, Sir, that in this matter of political prisoners, I come from a constituency which, though it may be called backward and illiterate, Salem, is yet politically conscious, and I do not think that any of two hon. Friends who represent the Salem rural area—Mr. Ellappa Chettiyar and Mr. Appavu Chettiyar—can dare to face their constituency to-morrow at a general election if they were to cast their vote to-day in favour of the Ministry in this House. I would appeal to my two

28th November 1923] [Dr. P. Subbarayan]

hon. Friends that they should cast their vote against the Ministry merely on this question of political prisoners, if not on anything else. I am sorry I have to say this, Sir, because I have the greatest admiration for the hon. the Chief Minister, and I have always thought that he would do his best by his country, but on account of the attitude taken on the question of political prisoners, I have no other alternative but to vote for the motion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Before we proceed further, let us clear the ground. Does the House want to have a general discussion upon every branch of the administration, both Reserved and Transferred, during the last three years, or does it want to have a discussion only on the merits or demerits of the Ministry during the last three years? I understood the hon. Member Mr. C. R. Reddi to say that he would confine himself to the Ministerial branch of the administration and that he would advise his followers also to confine themselves to that branch. From the speech of the hon. Member Dr. P. Subbarayan I understand that he is going to vote against the Ministers because of their action in regard to the political prisoners. I believe the treatment of political prisoners is a matter with the Reserved half and it will be absolutely impossible for me after this to make any attempt to restrict the discussion to the Ministerial half. It has become a general discussion with regard to every branch of the administration, and if, after this, the hon. the Executive Members of the Council tell me that they want to have an opportunity of defending their branch of the administration, I will have to say 'yes'."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, arising from your remarks, may I be permitted to make an observation? I am not here for one moment concerned with the question of political prisoners which portfolio belongs to my hon. Colleague, Mr. Knapp, who is not present here now, but who was present yesterday. In the course of the discussion certain suggestions were thrown out regarding the mode of conducting elections and the mode of exercise by His Excellency of his prerogative regarding nominations. Therefore, Mr. President, I crave your leave"

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"May I, with your permission, Sir, explain the situation a little more clearly. If I understood my hon. Friend, Dr. Subbarayan aright, he was not attacking the Ministers for their attitude towards the political prisoners. But he said that he changed from one side to the other on account of the sentiment with respect to the treatment to be accorded to the political prisoners thrown out here, reiterated and affirmed yesterday by the Leader of the party, the hon. Member, Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. It is that personal statement that is under discussion and not the attitude of the Ministers towards political prisoners."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I would point out that we are now concerned only with the Ministry and not with any sentiment of the hon. Member, Mr. Tyagaraya Chettiyar, however eminent that gentleman may be."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—"Mr. President, Sir, I never intended to take part in the discussion on this Motion, for I did not want to waste the time of the House. As for my political view on this question, it is patent: for the last three years I have been opposing the Ministry. But, yesterday, my hon. Friend from Chingleput attacked the Swarajists and that has dragged me out of my silence. Sir, he has attacked the Swarajists as non-co-operators who have come to the Council to wreck it. I am not going to answer that

[Mr. U. Rama Rao]

[28th November 1923]

question, and I shall leave it to his electors to settle with him when he faces them after three years, or in a bye-election, or, if the Council is dissolved earlier, which God forbid. As for Swarajists, they are honest; they have the courage of their convictions; they have a large following in the country; they have been following the mandate of the large number of their electors outside this Council. They have come into the Council at a great sacrifice, and, fortunately, the Congress gave them permission to enter the Council, though rather very late, as otherwise this Council must have had a large number of men sitting on this side of the House.

"Then, Sir, as for the Ministry, the same old Ministry continues with the exception of one who has been chucked out and who has been replaced by another gentleman. It is the same old Ministry, and in fact, the present Ministry is less strong than the previous one. They have only been drawing a fat pay and travelling in luxurious saloons. Now, the work of four is being done by seven gentlemen. The only things they have produced are the three Bills. One Minister brought forth a child, which I may call in the medical language, *hydrocephalus*, a child with a big head containing more water than brain and a small body, which is of no use to the world except to its parents and that too to look after it till it dies. The second Minister has brought forth a child which is still-born, a child with no life. So there is no money to go on with his scheme. The third Minister, i.e., the Chief Minister, brought forth a child which was prematurely born, a child which has not finished its full term of pregnancy because it was ill-conceived. With regard to that measure people were not given sufficient time to express an opinion in the matter and it is still in a dying condition. A child born premature cannot live. It is still kept in the incubator for the arrival of His Excellency the Viceroy, and unless undue influence is brought to bear on him the Bill may not be passed, and the child may not live long."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I understand the hon. Member to suggest that undue influence might be brought to bear on the Viceroy. May I know whether it is alleged by the hon. Member that any hon. Member of this Council will bring to bear any such undue influence?"

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"Some people who are [outside this House may bring to bear undue influence on His Excellency."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"If that is so, the hon. Member is in order in so stating it."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"As for Local Self-Government, the hon. the Minister in charge has sacrificed Local Self-Government efficiency for the purpose of party programme. So far as the medical portfolio is concerned, he has not extended medical relief. On the other hand, he has sent away numbers of assistant surgeons and sub-assistant surgeons, and, instead of extending medical relief during his last tenure of office, has really stopped any such extension. Ministers have opposed every popular measure which was intended to advance the interests of this country, and my predecessors have spoken in detail on that. I do not want to take the time of the House by enumerating all that.

"As for my hon. Friend from Chingleput, he warned us that, unless all the Swarajists completely co-operated with the Government and became toadies like himself, there was no chance of our doing any work in the Council in

28th November 1923] [Mr. U. Rama Rao]

future. I may tell my hon. Friend that unless and until he becomes a Swarajist he will have no chance of getting into the new Council after three years if he continues at this rate in this Council. With these few words, I would strongly support the motion before the House."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, I originally intended to give my silent vote in support of this motion. . But the trend that the debate has been taking compels me to say a few words in support of the motion tabled and moved in such eloquent terms by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi. It is indeed a welcome sign of the times to find the hitherto staunch adherents of the 'Justice' party crossing the floor, taking their seats in the front opposition benches and trying to lead the opposition. So far as I am concerned, and so far as some of us on this side of the House are concerned, we always belonged to Opposition Benches and we wish to continue to be members on this side of the House. So far, no charge of inconsistency can be laid at our door. But when we find loyal adherents of the party crossing the floor, it puts us in mind of the fact that there is something wrong somewhere. Hitherto, for the past three years, we of this Opposition have been incessantly delivering our attacks upon the party in power. If our attacks proved ineffective or ineffectual, it is not due to the fact that there was anything wrong with the powder and shot we employed but it was mainly due to the strong fortifications and strong defences which the party in power put forward. Now we find sentry after sentry deserting their citadel ; those who were guarding it and those who were defending it carefully are not only deserting but also joining with us in storming that citadel. This is indeed a healthy sign of the times. But what is it due to? The answer is perfectly clear, and the question we are now considering raises, in my humble judgment, a plain, simple and straightforward issue. The Ministry, as every hon. Member is perfectly aware, is responsible to the Legislature and through the Legislature to the people at large, and, therefore, we, representatives of the people, have every right to pronounce our verdict upon the main question raised as to whether the Ministry now holding office does or does not command the confidence of the House. If I understood the hon. the Minister for Education aright, he said that the rank and file of his party has not suffered in numbers. But this much I wish to say, that the present constitution of the Council is fundamentally, and I may add radically, different from its predecessor which it has replaced. Now we are having in large numbers in this Council men belonging to different schools of political thought, men holding definite and defined views on the burning political questions of the hour. So far as the last Council is concerned, the 'Justice' party was undoubtedly predominant ; it swamped and flooded the Council. But do we come across a similar situation to-day ? I may also say that so far as Swarajists are concerned, they have defined their position. We have defined our position, and we have heard from the lips of our hon. Friend, Mr. Abbas Ali, who belonged to a party which in the late Council was loyal to the Ministerialist party, telling us in no uncertain terms that he and the members of his party, thirteen in number, are going to vote in support of the motion before the House. I also find some members whom I used to see on the Treasury Benches not keeping to their seats there but sitting elsewhere, and therefore I infer—I do not know whether I am right or wrong—that they are not prepared any longer to owe allegiance to the Ministerialist party. That is again another thing which this election has brought in its train. And if you just compare and consider the

[Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar] [28th November 1923]

figures at the polls, we have numerous instances of anti-Ministerialists topping or heading the polls. That, again, is a very healthy sign of the times. There is no use of shutting oneself to the plain and simple fact that the party in power has suffered very substantially in its rank and file. Now, there may be some who owe allegiance to the party, but their number is fast going down. As I said before, the only issue for consideration is whether the Ministry possesses the confidence of this House. Sir, with your permission, I propose to confine myself solely and exclusively to the Ministerialist half, and I venture to submit in all humility that the Ministry is not entitled to the confidence of the House. Time and again, the Ministry has come in for a large share of adverse criticism at my hands within the last three years of its existence, and if I stand to-day to express that feeling, it is more to confirm the belief that I entertained ever since the formation of the Ministry three years ago. But one word I should like to say with respect to this motion. This motion is long overdue, and I would have welcomed a motion of this character nearly two years ago. But all the same on that ground alone I do not propose to consider the motion in any different light, and all the same it does not detract from its intrinsic worth and merit. There is no use of disguising the fact that there is a good deal of discontent.

"My hon. Friend, Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar, told us the other day that a motion of this character was a dangerous weapon to be sparingly used on occasions of emergency. I agree with him that such a useful and effective weapon should no doubt be taken out of the armoury on occasions of emergency.

11 30 a.m. "But I do not agree with him when he says that this is a dangerous weapon. It is a good, potent and useful weapon. We have been using it very sparingly as we have not taken it out of the armoury for the last three years and this shows that we have been scrupulously careful in its use. Then, again, it is said that it must be used only on occasions of emergency. If it is not used now, it is impossible to conceive of any such occasion arising again. It is just the time to feel the pulse of the House.

"The Minister for Education told us that there was nothing of which the Ministry could be ashamed. With your permission, Sir, I shall place before the House only a few matters and leave it to decide whether these acts redound to the credit, character and fair name of the Ministry we are now attacking. At any rate, they have not done anything which they can be proud of having done. The first act of the Ministry was the raising of the toll from 3 annas to 4 annas, thereby increasing the burden of taxes upon the poor people. Is that an act, I ask, of which the Ministry may reasonably be proud? Then, Sir, what was the attitude of the Ministry when we tabled a resolution to extend the electoral franchise to fill up the places of local board and district board presidents? There was a great deal of opposition. Was that an act of which any Ministry might be proud? Then again we have the selection committees, elected upon a narrow communal basis, for the purpose of regulating admissions into colleges. Is that an act they can be proud of? Then there is the Hindu Religious Endowments Bill which I think is no more than an outrage upon Hindu feelings, sentiments and susceptibilities. It has wounded the pious and religious section of the community in general and has roused a storm of opposition. So far as the Local Self-Government Department is concerned, I think they must come in necessarily for a large and well-merited share of adverse criticism. And who is responsible for that? The Minister of course."

28th November 1923]

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Excepting for some of the presidents of district boards, all the presidents, chairmen, municipal councils, are appointed by election and the Minister is not responsible for these appointments.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I wish to know whether there are people nominated to the taluk boards and municipalities ? ”

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ The member from Chingleput who spoke yesterday justified these appointments on party grounds. Then again, the House will remember that when I interpellated the Chief Minister and drew his attention to this violation on the part of the district boards, the answer was not coming up for about six months and after that time the Minister said that the Government had no information. I venture to submit that this House is entitled to better treatment than the scant courtesy that was shown by the Minister. My complaint is that this department used as a party machine for party purposes. In efficiency and corruption are writ large in these departments. Nominations to these bodies were nothing but a great scandal.

“ Just a word or two more, Sir, before I resume my seat. So far as the Minister for Education is concerned, he has done absolutely nothing to put down the drink evil which has been undermining the manhood of the nation. The revenue has been increasing in that direction by leaps and bounds, and nothing tangible or perceptible has been done to check the evil. It is true that, before the election, the party in power, with one foot securely implanted in the mutts and temples and the other in local bodies and institutions, hoped to stride the country like colossus. On its onward march, it lost its balance and lost almost all its followers. And this morning, too, a member belonging to that community, Dr. Subbarayan, has come over to our side. Does not this show the temper of the House ? Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar reminded us of the resolve of the hon. Member, Mr. C. R. Reddi, that he would not support a Ministry not composed exclusively of Non-Brahmans. I shall not be frightened by that statement ; we shall welcome any Ministry whose outlook is wide, whose views are progressive and who will be responsive to public opinion instead of flouting it. I do not care for its composition. With these few words, I support the motion before the House.”

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—“ Sir, Mr. President, I rise to give my unstinted support to the Vote of ‘ No-Confidence ’ in the Ministry moved so very eloquently and in such lucid manner by my hon. Friend Mr. Ramalinga Reddiyar. This exposition of the case was so very perspicuously clear and convincingly exhaustive that I do not wish to make any elaborate attempt at supplementing him. I wish only to make a few remarks in support of his motion and thus salve my conscience.

“ I did not want to make any remark about the city elections ; but my name was dragged into it, and I should make my position clear. Sir, I fought my election as an avowed opponent of the Leader of the Ministerialist Party. With all the influence he can command, with the three Ministers at his back, with all the appeal he made to the people whom he did not want to give a single vote on a former occasion, with all the assistance he had from them, democracy asserted itself in the city. I may safely say that the metropolis has already voted ‘ No-Confidence ’ in the Ministerialist Party. Sir, as to the mufassal there are very few gentlemen here, who made their way into this Council with a Ministerialist label. I am sorry to note that some of the

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

[28th November 1923]

hon. Members that fought the election as independent candidates are sitting on the Ministerialist side. I hope it is a mistake and at the time of voting they will vote in favour of the motion.

"Sir, the hon. Mr. Patro told us yesterday, or rather hoodwinked us by saying, that all the Non-Brahmans who have been elected are Ministerialists. He may be right in doing so because it is the custom of the Ministerialist Party not to put up candidates for the various districts, nor to issue any propaganda, but to claim the elected Non-Brahmans as their party men. Sir, I wish to inform the hon. Mr. Patro, that the Justice Party has a creed which the Ministerial adherents may not know. For most of them became party men only after the party came into power. My hon. Friend Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar asked us yesterday 'what to do if the party goes away?'. I ask him a question in turn: What is the use of a party which is of no consequence? They are neither useful to the country nor to the community. We have a very good constitutionalist and statesman at the head of our Government and he will find for us a much better Ministry than the one we have to-day. The hon. Mr. Patro expressed yesterday that the democratic conscience of my hon. Friend, Mr. Reddi, was awakened only at the Madras Dravidian Association on the 13th November. Sir, I may ask him to recollect that there was a feeling against the Ministry even a year ago, a feeling that the Ministers are autocratic, exclusive and not communicative."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I know nothing of the kind."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"I am sorry for his memory. Sir, this feeling reached its climax at the budget session. Resolutions were tabled against the Ministry, compromises were effected and a party executive was formed; only it had its burial soon after its birth."

"Now, Sir, this Ministry headed by the hon. the Raja of Panagal has forfeited the confidence of this august House. Sir, this is not an irresponsible assertion flung out in a haphazard way, but one form of deep rooted conviction—conviction based upon an intimate and close observation of the actions of the Ministry not in consonance with the original principles to which it had pledged itself. The original principles were admittedly democratic but when it came to an application of those principles in practice, the Ministry has been showing the cloven foot. Sir, I want to demonstrate the justice of the statement I have made through concrete facts in support thereof. I do not want to make vague generalisations."

"Sir, I am afraid there is a sort of misapprehension that personal considerations have got the better of me and clouded my vision. I have been a loyal and consistent follower of the Ministerial Party and was one of its staunchest supporters, and from a willing supporter to the most determined opponent, it is indeed a metamorphosis. I shall explain to the House, Sir, the causes that are at the bottom of this change. The Ministry was pledged to the principle of justice and equal opportunities to all. Sir, it is a principle based upon love and not upon hatred, a principle to be utilized solely for the elevation of the country and for nation-building. It is through this principle alone that Hindu-Moslem unity and unity with the other communities are to be permanently established. Now, Sir, you have heard from my hon. Friend Mr. Abbas Ali yesterday that the Ministry was undutifully indifferent to this principle, a charge from which the Ministry cannot easily extricate itself."

11-45 a.m.

28th November 1923] [Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

"Sir, I now come to the problem of the depressed classes. The problem of the depressed classes is one which has engaged the assiduous attention of the whole of India. It is not a problem to be treated in a halting and half-hearted way as the Ministers did contrary to their own professions. Sir, the support which the depressed classes were having even in the pre-Reform days from the British Government was indeed a paternal one; but it was so inadequate that the late Dr. T. M. Nair in his swelling sympathy for their hard lot, brought them into the movement which he inaugurated and enjoined on all the caste Hindus that followed to bestow a fostering care over them and thus look to their emancipation from their social bondage and also for their elevation from their miserable condition, thus ushering into existence a social revolution through his sacred and humane endeavour, our party, Sir, the Ministerial Party I mean (Laughter) pledged itself to support the depressed classes through thick and thin. But here is what Mr. M. C. Raja observed in one of his speeches during the last budget session. He was the Leader of the depressed classes. He said:

'I am sorry moreover that in some districts, Presidents of local bodies have become more bold in ignoring the claims of the depressed classes for representation on their respective councils. When these grievances are brought to the notice of the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government we are told,—'

"as he told us just now—

'that the nominations are in the hands of the Presidents, and sometimes that Government have no information; and that we had better appeal to the particular president: a case of appeal from Philip Sober to Philip Drunk, with a sense of chuckling triumph. Such is the plight to which we have been reduced; and for this, our eternal thanks and blessings are due to the Minister for Local Self-Government. If my people have to appeal to the very perpetrators of wrong in such cases, what, I venture to ask, is the Minister for Local Self-Government for? Has he not even the power of sanction and remonstrance, seeing that in many cases these presidents are his own nominees? Can he not even obtain information? Or is it a case of collusion? I am informed that in some instances that is the case. Mr. Galletti, the Collector of Chingleput, recently sent up two names of the depressed class men for nomination to the Saidapet Municipal Council. The Minister, for reasons of his own, thought it fit to nominate only one. I am therefore compelled to think that the fact that more men of my community are not appointed to several local bodies and municipal councils is due to the reactionary prejudices of the Minister for Local Self-Government. I hope that he, or his successor, whoever he be, will pursue a more liberal, a more progressive, a more enlightened and a more democratic policy in the future.'

"Sir, the attitude of the Chief Minister towards the depressed classes smacks of a certain stand-offish aloofness which, if he is allowed to continue, may harden itself. Sir, that his democratic intentions are a colossal camouflage is seen in this very single instance. More instances could be adduced but I have no time to enumerate them here. I shall, however, indicate one more instance of the precious sentiments which the hon. the Minister for Education delivered himself of when the question of increasing the scholarship for boys and girls of the depressed classes came up for discussion here. It is proved beyond doubt that the Ministry categorically failed to evince the sympathy which it professed to have for the depressed classes.

"Sir, I shall now speak about labour as far as it concerns us and not the Reserved subject. Labour to-day stands as much untouched and unprotected as it was in the pre-Ministry days. If the Ministry had attended to these labouring classes, many a labour trouble in Madras would have been averted. As regards the Malabar Tenancy Legislation, obviously, Sir, it is a democratic measure. Sir, this question of Malabar tenancy has thrown tenants of Malabar into an eddy of agitation. I think most of the members sent from Malabar are expressly charged to see that the Bill is passed. Sir, at the last

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar] [28th November 1923]

non-Brahman Confederation, it was pathetic sight to behold and hear the plaintive pleadings of the manifold sufferings from a contingent of Malabar tenants. The party there gave their unqualified support to the Bill, but the Ministry went back on the plighted word by putting off the issues and not getting the measure enacted earlier. Is their a greater betrayal of the democratic intentions so superbly professed, but so unceremoniously brushed aside when it came to application in practice? Sir, I am glad my hon. Friend Dr. Subbarayan has changed his vision. I congratulate the House for that. It was only the other day when he attended the meeting of the Madras Dravidian Association he said that the Tenancy problem was such an abstruse and knotty one."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I have only changed the general view."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, he has changed his general view. I congratulate him for what he said. Even doctors like Mr. Subbarayan cannot unravel difficult problems; the view held by them being that land legislation ought to be proceeded with with very great caution, which in effect means that things should remain where they are. Was not the City Tenants' Act passed in this Council when necessity and prudence demanded it? What was possible in the case of the City Tenants' Act could have been certainly possible in the tenancy legislation, if the Ministry had acted up to their promises. I am sorry, Sir, that the Ministry is headed by a blue-blooded Raja and the tenants of Malabar should expect this blessing on the Greek Kalends."

Mr. J. F. SALDANHA :—" I want to ask the hon. Member to say what the views of the Ministry are regarding the Tenancy Bill."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD (*in the chair*) :—" I am afraid that is not a point of order. The hon. Member should allow the Member to go on."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" I am glad that the hon. Member Mr. Krishnan Nayar assured the House that the Raja Sahib was accepting the underlying principles of the Bill. I have only to underline the word 'underlying'."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" I did not say that I accepted the underlying principle. But I only said that so far as the giving of occupancy right to the cultivating ryot is concerned, I am personally in favour of it."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, coming to the reorganization of the Madras University, where was the necessity for the reorganization of the University when primary education ought to have had priority of claim and the attention of a popular Minister. Sir, Government is profuse in their sympathy towards the masses but the masses are allowed to grow in rampant ignorance. At the fag end of the term the hon. the Education Minister makes pretences to reorganize primary education while he allowed his precious two years to be wasted in propounding a costly University scheme. The popular Minister is appointed to propagate literacy among the masses, but he sets himself for the propagation of education among the upper classes. This preference of upper class education is almost a death-blow to the education of the masses. Primary education ought to have been the first charge on a popular Ministry."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Primary education has received much impetus after the Education Minister has taken charge."

28th November 1923]

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" It should have received much more. Sir, the poor tax-payer is bled white to educate the children of the upper classes while his own children are not given the privilege of having the benefit of the three R's.

" Now I come to retrenchment. It bleeds one's heart to find how retrenchment was carried on to the great detriment of lower grades of public servants and how many a poor family was driven to agonising distress. The retrenchment in the Medical and Public Works Departments is atrocious. What is the use of retrenching at the lower, the wrong end while the top heavy system of administration is allowed to continue ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" May I point out that so far as retrenchment in the Medical Department is concerned, it was carried out on the recommendations of the Finance Committee, of which the hon. Member was a prominent Member ? "

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, I did raise my protest even in the Finance Committee. Sir, the Medical Department under the tender mercies of the Minister for Local Self-Government, has come in for a greater share of the application of the inexorable pruning knife. Sir, it is found that there is only one medical man for every 20,000 of the population. It is the opinion of the experts and the public that there should be one medical man for every thousand of the population."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I have the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee in the Public Works Department. They want to effect greater retrenchment than what I have so far done, and the hon. Member himself is a member of the Committee."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" I know how the public will view the recommendation and how they will receive the words of the Minister in charge of the Public Works Department, when more medical relief is required for the people of the land many of the assistant surgeons and sub-assistant surgeons have been sent away."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" May I point out that men who were given notice were men not actually in service but men who were intended to be on the leave reserve and for whom there was no opportunity to serve ? Moreover when they are released on pensions they are allowed to have private practice so that medical relief spreads over a much larger area."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" I am speaking of young men who have put in five or six years of service in the department and have been let loose in Madras for eking out their livelihood in a most pitiable way. I am speaking of these people. If medical relief is to be given in real earnest and if it is to be extended the services of more men are required for the Presidency, and these men ought not to have been sent away from service. Sir, as to the retrenchment in the Public Works Department I do not understand how retrenchment at the bottom will help the irrigation of unirrigated agricultural tracts.

" Sir, I have placed before this House proofs, by enumeration of facts, that the Ministry have not stood by the principle they had pledged themselves to at the beginning. They have betrayed the confidence which the public and the democracy had reposed in them. Out of

12 noon.

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar] [28th November 1923]

the democratic non-Brahman movement they have developed for themselves a close fisted oligarchy compared to which any other oligarchy that existed previously was tolerable (hear, hear). Sir, I appeal to the hon. Members of the various communities that are present here to vote for this resolution and thus replace plutocratic Ministry by a sincere and democratic one."

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR:—"Sir, yesterday when I heard the hon. Member representing the Brahman community, Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar, and the hon. Member representing the Muhammadan community, Mr. Abbas Ali, I thought that we were running into communal grooves and that we like some thrown-out entities from a collective mass would be repelling against each other and create political chaos which will lead to disaster and ruin. So, Sir, I thought it would be better to put up with the present evil than run into something unknown. But, Sir, when I look behind, I hear the voice of the people in my electorate—I mean the ryots in my electorate. As one hon. Member said, we really represent the ryots of our constituency. Sir, when I went to them to canvass votes, the questions put by them were: 'Will you guard our interests? Will you remove the difficulties we feel with regard to the reserve forests? Will you remove the taxes that are yearly imposed upon our land?' These are the questions that are repeatedly put by the electorate. Sir, it may not be possible to carry on Local Self-Government without a district board cess, a taluk board cess or an educational cess. But what I say is that we must try to elevate the condition of these ryots and make them bear willingly their burden of the taxation. Unless we achieve something towards this end, we shall be failing in our duty and a Ministry which has not achieved anything in this direction cannot command the confidence of the general electorate."

"One word more, Sir, and I shall sit down. My hon. Friend, speaking about Chirala municipality, said that it was the rich people who suffered by the introduction of the municipality and that the poor derived all the benefits therefrom. But, Sir, I have some experience of the municipal life in my district. I know it is the poor people who own jutkas, bullock-carts, etc., and earn their livelihood by means of them that suffer. They own small houses and depend for their daily bread on their daily labour. It is these people who are affected by the introduction of the municipality, for they have to pay the horse-tax, the bullock-tax, etc., and in addition the house-tax. Payment of these taxes means parting with something of their daily bread. So, Sir, it is the poor who are most affected by the introduction of municipality. It may be that the rich will have to pay double or triple of what they were paying before but they dole out the money from their pockets though with some murmur."

"With these few words I support the motion of my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, and I also request my brother colleagues from Madura to support it."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I rise to support the motion of my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi. So far as this resolution is concerned, I am in perfect agreement with him. The Ministry has been recruited from what is called the Justice Party. The Justice Party as such has no political complexion. It is based upon communal bias against one large community of this country. A party, which excludes from it an intelligent community like the Brahman, has no business to exist as a political party,

28th November 1923] [Mr. Sami Venkatachala Chettiyar]

and it would be the negation of all democracy to entrust the administration of any province to such a kind of party which has absolutely no claim to be what is called the democratic party. Whatever might be the professions which the Ministers and their adherents have been making, their past conduct is a negation of all right principles. They have disregarded the Hindu religion by bringing in the Hindu Religious Endowments Bill. I am glad that the assent of His Excellency the Viceroy has not yet been given to this Bill. They have generally disregarded the welfare of the ryot by throwing out the Madras Irrigation Bill. They have shown scant courtesy to the political workers of this country by saying that political prisoners should be treated worse than felons. I thought there would be a change of programme at least for the future so that the party might be consolidated. That hope has been shattered yesterday by the Leader of the party expressing himself in no unmistakeable terms that he still sticks to that opinion. I know, Sir, Sir Tyagaraya Chettiyar's leadership is almost unquestioned in his party."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"The opinion of Sir Tyagaraya Chettiyar is not shared by the party generally. The view of Sir Tyagaraya Chettiyar, repeated by him yesterday, is not shared by the party. It is his personal view."

MR. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"May I take it that the hon. Ministers do not acknowledge Sir Tyagaraya Chetti's leadership in this matter?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"In his personal views on the matter we do not join with him."

MR. SAMI VENKATACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I anticipated this objection and I was about to answer it. I know that his influence in the party is very great and I know if he says a thing his followers would religiously follow him. That was my fear when I said that when the Leader had announced himself in no unmistakeable terms that he still stuck to that opinion, there was absolutely no hope of placing any confidence in the adherents of that party. That was why such of those who felt conscientious objection to follow his lead have come out like Dr. Subbarayan.

"It is a pity that in the matter of administration of district boards and taluk boards, the hon. the Minister for Education has burked the responsibility."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"Sir, I have my turn to reply."

MR. SAMI VENKATACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"I do not know if the hon. the Chief Minister will also burk the responsibility as his lieutenant has done. Whatever that may be, it cannot be denied that out of so many district boards only two have got elected presidents, while the third has got its elected president only a few months ago. It is the Ministry that is responsible for the proper administration of the district boards. The condition of the district boards is so deplorable that it came for a severe condemnation by no less a person than the Head of the Administration—His Excellency the Governor. In attenuation of that fact my hon. Friend the Minister for Education has said that soon after the Reform Act had come into force the financial relations were adjusted and during that adjustment the district boards were left without the subsidies they were usually getting from the Government and that though powers were given to the district boards for tapping other

[Mr. Sami Venkatachala Chettiyar] [28th November 1923]

sources of revenue, they had not been taken advantage of. I cannot speak with authority in the case of district boards, but I can speak in the name of the Madras Corporation. We have applied to the Government to allow us to tax entertainments such as cinemas, races and others. But till to-day the Government has not been pleased to reply."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"It is a financial question and we have to get the sanction of the Government of India."

MR. SAMI VENKATACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"The Ministers are not only the heads of the branches of the administration with regard to the Transferred subjects but they are also the Indian Advisors to the Reserved Half. If by their influence they are not able to prevail upon the Reserved Half to come to the succour of the depleted revenues of municipalities and district boards, I am afraid the existence of a number of Indians in the Cabinet would be absolutely of no use to the country.

"The hon. the Minister for Education has spoken of retrenchment. I do not know what retrenchment has been carried on during the past three years. But one thing that is visible is that there has been no retrenchment so far as the higher salaried officials are concerned. For that matter, there has been no retrenchment in the case of the salaries of the Ministers themselves. They ought to have set an example to the country by making a decent reduction in their own salaries. I know that at the end of the term of the office last time, and just perhaps in answer to a resolution which was tabled by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, they cut off about a thousand rupees in their pay. But that comes with a very bad grace.

"Referring to the elections, Sir, I do not know if proof is still needed that the Justice Party had no support in the elections. I dare say even amongst those who are now sitting on the Ministerial Benches, many have not openly declared themselves as Justice Party candidates. If they had gone as Justice Party candidates, they should have said to the electorate that they were going to force upon the country the Hindu Religious Endowments Bill, that they were going to stand against the separation of judicial and executive functions, and that they would throw out the resolution for the introduction of the conscience clause. They should have made all these things plain to the electorate. On the other hand, the fact is that they made absolutely no declaration on these matters. All that could, therefore, be inferred in the absence of any declaration is that they must have proposed, in the process of canvassing from house to house, that they would not countenance the Acts made by them during the past three years. Otherwise it would not have been possible for any of them to have been returned. I may also say that on account of the suspicion that one belonged to the Justice Party one ran the risk of losing a thousand votes. They should have come out openly and said that they belonged to the Justice Party. After all that has been stated it behoves every one of us present here to remember only what has been done by the previous administration without any pronouncement as regards their future programme except a statement by the Leader of the party that political prisoners should be treated worse than felons."

12-15 p.m. MR. VENKATARAMA AYYAR *alias* V. PANTULU AYYAR :—"Mr. President, the hon. Member, Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar, has been pleased to indicate the political inconsistencies of the Swaraj Party, and

28th November 1923] [Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar *alias* V. Pantulu Ayyar]

he may be right. But I want to assure him that if there is any sin it lies at his door and at that of his party. The indecent haste with which the Religious Endowments Bill was rushed through this House without any regard to the declared wishes of the people and without any reverence for the sanctity of those institutions evoked a storm of indignation in our district which almost forced us into this House, and, I may add, that the betrayal of the Ministers in not advising the Government properly about the enhancement of the assessment of land revenue in our district has also provoked the people in our district to a great extent. As one of my hon. Muhammadan friends had been complaining yesterday, even after years of their loyalty to the party in power very little has been done to them."

Mr. ABBAS ALI KHAN :—" Nothing has been done to them." (Laughter.)

Mr. VENKATARAMA AYYAR *alias* V. PANTULU AYYAR :—" My complaint is that too much has been done to us. We have not been left alone. On our devoted heads have been inflicted the Religious Endowments and Resettlement Bills. Our hon. Indian Christian Friend, Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar, has been advocating forgiveness for past action. I agree to it because our guru also preaches the same. . . ."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—" I never said that."

Mr. VENKATARAMA AYYAR *alias* V. PANTULU AYYAR :—" Even if nobody said that, I say that. I say that such of those who repent sincerely for their past actions may be forgiven; but forgiveness should not be given without repentance. There should be a firm purpose of amendment in the future; and in the absence of that I vote against the Ministers and for the motion brought forward by my hon. Friend Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" The position of the non-Brahmans to-day may be compared to that of a number of comrades who have been running a race up a hill under a few leaders. Having reached a certain height, they quarrel amongst themselves as to who shall lead them, and the leadership of those who were leading them until now is challenged. They divide themselves into two or more sections. At this point, when we are up the hill there is a deep chasm or abyss. The Swarajist or the Nationalist arrives on the scene. He is ready to throw the weight of his influence and strength, which by itself is very little, with those who have questioned the authority or right of those who were hitherto leading. The Swarajist's object is not really to help either party to get on further in the race but to destroy both parties one after the other. He is ready to aid one of the contending parties to push the other down so that they may fall into the abyss, so that after one party has been dealt with it may be easy to deal likewise with the other. That this is their object has been declared in unmistakable terms by my hon. Friend, Mr. Satyamurti, in an eloquent speech which was not wanting in frankness as to what his object is. He has expressed his distrust of the entire lot of non-Brahmans, and his determination to overthrow them and destroy their influence. In equally unmistakable terms some other hon. Members from the northern districts who have spoken in Telugu have expressed their views. On the way we behave at this juncture depends whether we shall be hurled down the precipice and find our bones broken and our body mangled or whether we shall soon reach level country."

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiya] [28th November 1923]

"The cause for which the non-Brahman movement stands is dear to our heart. It stands for orderly progress towards the goal of responsible Government or Dominion Home Rule. It stands for law and order against violent attempts to overthrow existing authority in the desire to attain immediate Swaraj. It stands for securing equal opportunities for all classes in the distribution of power, of office and influence, instead of their being concentrated in one particular section or class as it hitherto was. Is unsatisfied personal ambition or disappointment at not having secured power to some individuals a reason to seek to impair the strength of this movement? Two years ago, my hon. Friend Mr. C. R. Reddi, in the early days of his political career in Madras, soon after he exchanged a career of useful activity in the educational field in Mysore for fresh fields and pastures new and for activity in another direction, i.e., in Madras or Indian politics in addressing meetings such as those convened under the auspices of the South Indian Liberal Federation (City Branch), he used to describe the Liberals or Moderates with whom he is now sitting in the front Opposition Benches as being all leaders without followers. My hon. Friend Dr. Natesan was in the early days of the City Branch of the South Indian Liberal Federation under the presidency of Mr. C. R. Reddi a little suspicious of the influence Mr. C. R. Reddi or the City Branch was gaining. To-day both Mr. C. R. Reddi and Dr. Natesan have the satisfaction of having become the leaders of the liberals whom the hon. Member Mr. C. R. Reddi sneered at in those days."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"We deny the leadership."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"All of them are sitting in the same bench."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"That may be."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"I was always a democrat."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"My hon. Friend Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar is sitting at the feet of Gamaliel."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"It is not my mistake."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"I am glad there are so many parties in this House."

"Now to resume my discussion. Little do Mr. Reddi and Dr. Natesan realize that the so-called Liberals or Nationalists as they now call themselves submitting to Dr. Natesan *cum* C. R. Reddi leadership, is but an instance of 'stooping to conquer'."

"The modern method of treating human beings from attacks of scourge like cholera, plague and other diseases is by the process of injection of a culture of plague and cholera germs in mild doses into the human system and this inoculation, as it is called, makes the system immune from or capable of resisting severe attacks of cholera and plague. In other words we conquer plague by plague and cholera by cholera. Our Liberal or Nationalist friends, the Swarajists, have realized that if you wish to conquer or overthrow the influence of the non-Brahmans it must be by setting up the non-Brahmans to fight amongst themselves. Is it any wonder that they have readily placed themselves under the leadership of non-Brahmans for the purpose of defeating the non-Brahman Ministry? I appeal to my non-Brahman friends to beware of the danger ahead."

28th November 1923]

Mr. P. ANJANEYALU :—" I request my hon. Friend whether he can give instances where these hon. Friends of the non-Brahman party were set up to fight amongst themselves."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—" We have not placed ourselves under the leadership of any."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" Well, these are like sheep without a shepherd. Whatever may be said of his colleagues in the leadership, my hon. Friend Mr. C. R. Reddi is a very shrewd man. He knew full well that any part formed avowedly in combination with the Brahmans will not commend itself to any non-Brahman party he was seeking to form. Therefore in the famous declaration of war which he made in the Dravidian Association on the 13th instant, when he unfurled his banner of revolt against the hon. Ministers, one of his declarations was as referred to by my hon. Friend Mr. Patro yesterday :

'In no circumstances will the Ministry to be formed in supersession of the present Ministry be other than non-Brahman'.

" This was for non-Brahman consumption and to put them off the track lest they suspect any alliance with the Brahman in which case they would have nothing to do with him or with the party he was organizing.

" Mr. C. R. Reddi was shrewd enough to know that our Brahman friends, whether they were or were not given a place in the Ministry to be newly formed by Mr. C. R. Reddi or by anybody of his revolting colleagues, were sure to give support to him by their speeches and votes; for he knew full well that whether he would or would not have them nothing could prevent their votes being given in his favour, for their object was not so much the overthrow of the present Ministry—that is but a trifle—but the overthrow of the non-Brahman party, and the undermining of their influence. It is not out of love for the hon. Members who have crossed the floor of the House; for does not the speech of my hon. Friend Mr. Satyamurti reveal that his grievance is not so much against the Ministers as against the wicked non-Brahman party which threw out the Conscience Clause Resolution, which moved or passed resolutions about taking reasonable safeguards to afford admission to non-Brahman boys in Government and other colleges which strengthened the hands of the executive in putting down lawlessness and violence with a stern hand? It would be better to refer to the resolution that was moved by my hon. Friend Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar in which he said that those institutions which insisted that religious lessons should be taught in them shall be under Grant-in-Aid Code too. What would be the fate of the non-Brahmans was revealed that day, as though by a revelation, by a paper that was placed in my hands in answer to an interpellation I made as to what was the strength of the Brahmans and non-Brahmans in the various Government colleges. As a consequence of passing this resolution, the Madras Christian College gave admission to 92 non-Brahmans as against 77 in the junior intermediate course. They gave admission in the pass course to 104 non-Brahmans instead of 60. Clearly the proportion was 200 to 100 per cent. Likewise it was in the St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly. If you go to the Madura College the number of non-Brahman candidates can be counted on one's fingers' ends. So also in places where they say that national education is being given to Indians by gentlemen of a particular class, non-Brahmans hardly have any admission. The doors are shut to them.

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [28th November 1923]

In the Mission schools where the doors are open to Brahmans and non-Brahmans alike the doors were open to non-Brahman candidates. Mr. Satyamurti was very vehement against the Ministers for having appointed a committee for regulating the doors of admission into the various colleges. In those days the number of students that could be admitted in any Government college was very limited. In former days one section of the community alone was able to get admission by any means. The non-Brahmans were only very few. My hon. Friend Mr. Thangavelu Pillai, I think, tabled a resolution that safeguards should be taken by the Government for securing proper facilities for non-Brahmans. It would have been a folly on his part not to have moved such a resolution. It was in pursuance of that resolution that this Council gave power to the Ministers to appoint that committee. Sir, in those days when non-Brahmans were like dumb animals nothing was heard. It was under those circumstances that this resolution was passed.

12-30 p.m. "Are you therefore under the guise of expressing disapproval of Ministers setting your seal of approval on this attempt to lay unholy hands on the fabric which the non-Brahman party has so successfully put up? I appeal to you, hon. Members, to sink all personal differences and not suffer any sense of personal disappointment to warp your judgment as to what your duty is at this present juncture.

"To Mr. Gladstone is attributed the statement that by every appointment he made, he caused dissatisfaction to about 20 persons. Likewise for the patronage which the Ministers have in their power to exercise the number of offices in their gift being limited and the number of aspirants being unlimited, those who suffered disappointment by reason of inability on the part of the Ministers to extend their patronage must, in some cases, be lacking in the appreciation of the Ministers.

"My hon. Friend Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi read out a long catalogue of acts of commission and omission on the part of the hon. the Chief Minister; but were those acts, all or any of them, with which the hon. the Minister is charged, committed before or after the last sitting of the previous Council? Some or all of them were committed before the last sitting and Mr. Reddi has been in the Council for nearly two years. What steps did Mr. Reddi take to bring them to the notice of the Chief Minister and, if they were not rectified, to bring them to the notice of the Legislative Council by means of resolutions or interpellations?

"If these acts of commission or omission were done after the last sitting, was it at a time when Mr. Reddi's beneficent influence, which kept the Ministers in order, was withdrawn? If his influence was to keep the Ministers in order and only the withdrawal of such influence renders possible an erratic course, why should Mr. Reddi set up an opposition to them? If as Mr. Saldanha stated yesterday, Mr. Reddi's object is not to seek office for himself in any new Ministry or as his answers to the interviewer in the 'Daily Express,' but published in the 'Hindu,' imply, then why not keep within the party with the Ministers and give the benefit of his wholesome influence? If I was asked to express an opinion about the Ministry, I would say that it was an unqualified success. For, it has to its credit many achievements both in legislation and other measures in respect of which their authors may well congratulate themselves. Whatever may be said now to the contrary by those in the front benches, the speeches delivered by my hon.

28th November 1923] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

Friend Mr. Ramalinga Reddi and my friend Dr. Natesan and recorded in the proceedings of this Council at the last session, give the lie direct to such accusation. 'Bravo Panagal!' were the words (laughter) with which Dr. Natesan acclaimed the Raja of Panagal both on behalf of himself and of children yet unborn in this land when the Religious Endowments Bill was piloted successfully through this House. Equally enthusiastic were the encomiums showered upon the hon. Mr. Patro by Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi on the passing of the Universities Bill, also at the last session and it is a known fact that he gave hearty co-operation to the Ministers in shaping the Bill both before and after it was presented to the House for its consideration.

"Then what is it that has since transpired which has led to this resolution about want of confidence being tabled? So far as the other Members of the Council are concerned they appear to be due to personal causes rather than difference in policy. Were there any measures or resolutions of far reaching importance involving change of policy over which Dr. Natesan and Mr. Reddi and Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar quarrelled with the Ministers? So far as I am able to gather they seem to be personal, rather than affecting the party."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"I have explained it in my speech. It is not personal. It is for policy's sake that I have separated from them."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"It is perfectly open to the hon. Member to say that it is not so; and it is equally open to another hon. Member to say that it is personal" (laughter).

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"As for Dr. Natesan's complaint about not receiving adequate support regarding communal representation, I appeal to those who sat in this House at the last Council and ask whether there was a more enthusiastic supporter of communal representation than myself and yet on some occasions, on account of the extravagance and unreasonableness of the demand and in the inopportune moment when such demands were made, many of the non-Brahmans, including my humble self, had to hang our heads in shame. But this does not prove that my or the Ministers' support for communal representation was any the less real.

"The reality of the zeal for communal representation ought to be tested not by the demands urged in the Council Chamber, but by conduct when occasions for testing such zeal arose or presented themselves. Such an occasion arose during the recent elections to this Council and to the Indian Legislative Assembly last month. What did we the residents in Madras who were actors and spectators see or hear? Dr. Natesan's agents were canvassing for Mr. Rangachari as against Mr. Satagopa Mudaliyar. . . ."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Mr. President, on a point of order may I suggest that Dr. Natesan canvassing votes for Mr. Rangachari for the Legislative Assembly is wholly irrelevant to the matter before the House?"

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"It is absolute falsehood, Sir."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"We have seen Dr. Natesan's agents canvassing votes for Mr. Rangachari. As for the relevancy of my speech, Mr. Satyamurti spoke about the splendid success which attended Mr. Natesan's candidature as against other people in the field. I am entitled to explain under what circumstances such success was attained."

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [28th November 1923]

In the Mission schools where the doors are open to Brahmans and non-Brahmans alike the doors were open to non-Brahman candidates. Mr. Satyamurti was very vehement against the Ministers for having appointed a committee for regulating the doors of admission into the various colleges. In those days the number of students that could be admitted in any Government college was very limited. In former days one section of the community alone was able to get admission by any means. The non-Brahmans were only very few. My hon. Friend Mr. Thangavelu Pillai, I think, tabled a resolution that safeguards should be taken by the Government for securing proper facilities for non-Brahmans. It would have been a folly on his part not to have moved such a resolution. It was in pursuance of that resolution that this Council gave power to the Ministers to appoint that committee. Sir, in those days when non-Brahmans were like dumb animals nothing was heard. It was under those circumstances that this resolution was passed.

12-30 p.m. "Are you therefore under the guise of expressing disapproval of Ministers setting your seal of approval on this attempt to lay unholy hands on the fabric which the non-Brahman party has so successfully put up? I appeal to you, hon. Members, to sink all personal differences and not suffer any sense of personal disappointment to warp your judgment as to what your duty is at this present juncture.

"To Mr. Gladstone is attributed the statement that by every appointment he made, he caused dissatisfaction to about 20 persons. Likewise for the patronage which the Ministers have in their power to exercise the number of offices in their gift being limited and the number of aspirants being unlimited, those who suffered disappointment by reason of inability on the part of the Ministers to extend their patronage must, in some cases, be lacking in the appreciation of the Ministers.

"My hon. Friend Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi read out a long catalogue of acts of commission and omission on the part of the hon. the Chief Minister; but were those acts, all or any of them, with which the hon. the Minister is charged, committed before or after the last sitting of the previous Council? Some or all of them were committed before the last sitting and Mr. Reddi has been in the Council for nearly two years. What steps did Mr. Reddi take to bring them to the notice of the Chief Minister and, if they were not rectified, to bring them to the notice of the Legislative Council by means of resolutions or interpellations?

"If these acts of commission or omission were done after the last sitting, was it at a time when Mr. Reddi's beneficent influence, which kept the Ministers in order, was withdrawn? If his influence was to keep the Ministers in order and only the withdrawal of such influence renders possible an erratic course, why should Mr. Reddi set up an opposition to them? If as Mr. Saldanha stated yesterday, Mr. Reddi's object is not to seek office for himself in any new Ministry or as his answers to the interviewer in the 'Daily Express,' but published in the 'Hindu,' imply, then why not keep within the party with the Ministers and give the benefit of his wholesome influence? If I was asked to express an opinion about the Ministry, I would say that it was an unqualified success. For, it has to its credit many achievements both in legislation and other measures in respect of which their authors may well congratulate themselves. Whatever may be said now to the contrary by those in the front benches, the speeches delivered by my hon.

28th November 1923]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The whole thing is done by ballot. It is not therefore possible for anybody to see whether an elector who gave his vote was a Brahman or a non-Brahman.”

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ Sir, we are permitted to be within the counting stations. We know numbers 4 and 5 were those of Dr. Natesan and his lieutenant. Cross marks were put only against numbers 4 and 5. Therefore it is not a matter of surprise that for about 36 hours or more when the ballot papers were being counted, numbers 4 and 5 came in such large numbers that it was seen that the votes came from a particular electorate only. It did not require much mental effort or an exercise in logic to see that.”

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—“ In my division and in so many other divisions the electors gave their votes only to 4 and 5 and it is not right to say that I got votes from a particular electorate only.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Order, order. I must insist upon further controversy into the merits of the Madras elections being stopped. The hon. Member must stick to the subject in issue.”

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ Dr. Natesan was good enough to say, from his point of view, ‘ the Ministry was a failure. Let it go.’ What does it matter? He does not address himself to the question. He has only spoken like an iconoclast who wishes to break an idol, because his God has not given him the blessing he wanted. What is going to happen if this Ministry goes ? ”

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—“ What is the blessing that I wanted ? It is a falsehood, Sir.”

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ Blessing at the hands of God. He now seeks to bring down the idol and break it. He has a tendency of destroying anything which is not of use to him.

“ As my hon. Friend, Mr. Satyamurti, has pointed out in a recent occasion, is there a published programme of the leaders of the present Opposition which shows that they have a programme of their own which indicates that theirs is in any way different from that of the party to which they belonged hitherto ? Have Dr. Natesan and Mr. Ramalinga Chetti during the three years’ tenure in the last Council and Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi during the two years’ tenure attempted or accomplished anything which marks them out as more progressive in their ideals or more capable in accomplishment ?

“ If the present Ministry goes and another Ministry with all or any of the leaders of the Opposition is set up, can it be possible to carry it without the aid of the votes of the Nationalists and Swarajists whose object is not to preserve but to destroy the existing fabric ? (Cries of ‘ No, no,’ from the Opposition benches).

“ The speech of the hon. Member, Mr. Satyamurti, indicates that by voting for this motion, he wishes the House to express disapproval not merely of the policy pursued by the Ministers—in the carrying out of the resolutions passed by the Council consisting of several who were in the last Council and were parties to such resolution—but also of the non-Brahmans who were in the last Council, but are not here now. So, Mr. Satyamurti’s view of this motion is that you are called upon to review not merely the conduct of the Ministers,

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiya]

[28th November 1923]

but of the members of the last Council who passed or rejected several resolutions. This, I think, is a dangerous precedent to follow in reviewing the work of the Ministers. The Ministers were but the agents of the Councillors in giving effect to resolutions of the Councils and it would be a wrong policy by means of 'no confidence' resolution on the Ministers to review the work of the old Council and to say that you do not approve of it. To pass this resolution would be to surrender to the wolves the Ministers, the agents of the last Council, who carried out and gave effect to the resolutions passed by the Council. Are you going to do this?

"Having regard to the serious consequences to the non-Brahman party as a whole, the attempt at injuring the party under the guise of merely censuring the Ministers must be resisted.

"It would be an act of ingratitude to those who have done well by their country to brand them as deserving of no confidence. It would be an act of self-destruction to support such a resolution.

"If this resolution is carried, what follows? The Ministers will be under a cloud; they may have to resign. Is it those who co-operated with them, who extolled their work and achievements, who until the last time this Council sat had no policy different from the Ministers suddenly turned into their accusers to be the persons to displace them? What is their past record or achievement during the time when they were in the past Council? What new policies—departures from the policy pursued by the Ministers—did they attempt and which did not succeed owing to the opposition from the Ministers? In the absence of such credentials to vote for this resolution would not merely be passing a stigma on the Ministers but to take a leap into the dark, to pass from regions known to us to unknown regions.

12-45 p.m. "It is unfortunate that our Muhammadan brethren have decided not to vote with the Ministry. Their grievances are that judicial and other appointments have not been provided for them. These are to be redressed by the Reserved half of the Government in respect of which the Ministers have no voice, and it is laying the blame at the wrong door by accusing the Ministers for not safeguarding their interests. It is a matter of common knowledge how in the matter of securing a seat for a Muhammadan gentleman in the Executive Council strenuous efforts were made by the hon. the Ministers, but that they did not succeed was not owing to want of advocacy of the claims of the Muhammadan brethren. It is to be hoped that they will still reconsider their views.

"I conceive this motion to be not merely an attempt at getting a change of Ministry but to cut at the root of the movement at the head of which stand not merely the Chief Minister but the revered Leader who sought no office or emoluments for himself but rejected it when it was offered to him and who like Moses of old is at the head of a large section of our countrymen in their onward march towards the goal of responsible Self-Government which the Joint Parliamentary Committee intended we should have, in the journey which our countrymen like the Israelites are making in the wilderness from bondage in the land of Pharaohs to the promised land flowing with milk and honey, from autocratic Government by the bureaucracy to responsible self-government. Many a time did the children of Israel rise in revolt against their Leader in their long and tedious journey in the wilderness, many a time did they attempt to slay him, but wiser counsels prevailed from time to time.

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [28th November 1923]

In the Mission schools where the doors are open to Brahmans and non-Brahmans alike the doors were open to non-Brahman candidates. Mr. Satyamurti was very vehement against the Ministers for having appointed a committee for regulating the doors of admission into the various colleges. In those days the number of students that could be admitted in any Government college was very limited. In former days one section of the community alone was able to get admission by any means. The non-Brahmans were only very few. My hon. Friend Mr. Thangavelu Pillai, I think, tabled a resolution that safeguards should be taken by the Government for securing proper facilities for non-Brahmans. It would have been a folly on his part not to have moved such a resolution. It was in pursuance of that resolution that this Council gave power to the Ministers to appoint that committee. Sir, in those days when non-Brahmans were like dumb animals nothing was heard. It was under those circumstances that this resolution was passed.

12-30 p.m. "Are you therefore under the guise of expressing disapproval of Ministers setting your seal of approval on this attempt to lay unholy hands on the fabric which the non-Brahman party has so successfully put up? I appeal to you, hon. Members, to sink all personal differences and not suffer any sense of personal disappointment to warp your judgment as to what your duty is at this present juncture.

"To Mr. Gladstone is attributed the statement that by every appointment he made, he caused dissatisfaction to about 20 persons. Likewise for the patronage which the Ministers have in their power to exercise the number of offices in their gift being limited and the number of aspirants being unlimited, those who suffered disappointment by reason of inability on the part of the Ministers to extend their patronage must, in some cases, be lacking in the appreciation of the Ministers.

"My hon. Friend Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi read out a long catalogue of acts of commission and omission on the part of the hon. the Chief Minister; but were those acts, all or any of them, with which the hon. the Minister is charged, committed before or after the last sitting of the previous Council? Some or all of them were committed before the last sitting and Mr. Reddi has been in the Council for nearly two years. What steps did Mr. Reddi take to bring them to the notice of the Chief Minister and, if they were not rectified, to bring them to the notice of the Legislative Council by means of resolutions or interpellations?

"If these acts of commission or omission were done after the last sitting, was it at a time when Mr. Reddi's beneficent influence, which kept the Ministers in order, was withdrawn? If his influence was to keep the Ministers in order and only the withdrawal of such influence renders possible an erratic course, why should Mr. Reddi set up an opposition to them? If as Mr. Saldanha stated yesterday, Mr. Reddi's object is not to seek office for himself in any new Ministry or as his answers to the interviewer in the 'Daily Express,' but published in the 'Hindu,' imply, then why not keep within the party with the Ministers and give the benefit of his wholesome influence? If I was asked to express an opinion about the Ministry, I would say that it was an unqualified success. For, it has to its credit many achievements both in legislation and other measures in respect of which their authors may well congratulate themselves. Whatever may be said now to the contrary by those in the front benches, the speeches delivered by my hon.

[28th November 1923]

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ May I correct my hon. Friend ? The resolution was not thrown out but the House passed on to the next item on the agenda on the motion of my Friend Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. We did not come to a conclusion upon it.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ May I submit that when the House resolved to go to the next item on the agenda it meant that it dropped the subject ? ”

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—“ The late Sir K. Srinivasa Ayyangar said that the resolution was very wide and that the Government could not accept it as it was and that they were prepared to consider favourably the cases of those people who deserved better treatment than that accorded to them at present. It was in these circumstances that my hon. Friend, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar, moved that the resolution may be passed on and I seconded the motion. I wish to bring to the notice of this Council that nothing was said against people who ought to be treated favourably.

“ Sir, with regard to the resolution itself I am in a most embarrassed position. When my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, for whom I have the greatest respect and with whom I worked heartily at the elections in my constituency, tabled the resolution, what was the position ? I am glad that when he addressed himself to that resolution he has scrupulously confined himself not to the question of the party but to the question of individual Ministry, as to whether this Ministry has the confidence of this House or not. But he did not count the forces which were associated with him in the discussion. We heard Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, who posed himself as the leader of the Nationalist Party which came into existence day before yesterday.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I never posed myself as leader. I was one of the speakers.”

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—“ Whether he is the leader or not or whether he would hereafter be elected or not is not my concern. He, as their mouthpiece, expressed his dissent on the subject of the constitution of the Ministry from one party, that is, the Non-Brahman Party. He said that it was to this that he objected. My hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, in his manifesto issued immediately after the Narayan Bagh conference said that he was not going directly or indirectly to associate himself with any Ministry which was not exclusively non-Brahman and I expected my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, would say something about it and would make his position clear. Before he asks vote on his present motion, he has not said anything at all about his views. If it is a case in which the achievements and record of the party have to be scrutinized and looked upon in the proper light, then I submit that he ought to say whether he approves or does not approve of the various acts for which the party was responsible, the various communal Government Orders, the selection committees appointed for various colleges, etc. I therefore take it that he is taking objection to the individual Ministry which is formed and not against the party programme as a whole.

“ Now, Sir, it is one of the contentions of the Nationalists that this very principle of selection of members for the Ministry from one party was bad and that the Ministry must, on that account, go. This is the same thing as what Mr. Satyamurti put up. I therefore request hon. Members of this Council to say whether they agree to it or not—whether they approve that the Ministers should be selected from the non-Brahman Party or not.

28th November 1923] [Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

" Sir, with regard to the remarks made by Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, what I have to say is that he drew the attention of this House to a remark made by His Excellency the Governor in opening this Council that the administration of district boards was very lax. I submit, Sir, that that is rather a sweeping remark to make. Of course, Sir, this House or such of the members who represent local boards, will disapprove of it. Sooner or later I expect the members to give expression to it. My hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, will bear with me when I say that though I was the President of the Chittoor District Board and very widely toured with him throughout the district no influence of mine was brought to bear either directly or indirectly upon the electorate. I cannot say the same thing of other hon. Members who are associated with other local boards throughout the Presidency. I think they also would be of the same opinion.

" To make such a remark from what His Excellency said on the opening day of this Council and to condemn the Ministry on that score is one that I think is hardly fair. If there was any laxity at all in the administration and if there was any defect at all it was due to the financial stringency that was prevailing.

" What is the record of the Ministry? A provision of five lakhs had been made in the budget for the year before last to make up the deficits of local boards. In the year 1922-23 this Council made a provision of eighteen lakhs to provide for the deficits and steps have been taken ever since to place the local boards on an efficient basis. May I say, Sir, that many of these local boards have been able to make both ends meet? I see that my hon. Friend, Mr. Narasimhachari, is not satisfied with this amount even. Then it is this House that must arm the hon. Minister with the amount that will be required.

" It was said that the Religious Endowments Bill was bad. It was said also that the University Bill was bad. I think that my hon. Friend, Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar, was on the Select Committee on the Bill, at any rate he wanted to be on that Committee."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—" I never wanted to be on any committee."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" My hon. Friend supported the Bill throughout. My memory may be short and my hon. Friend
1 p.m. may correct me if I am wrong. When the University Bill was ushered in he rose up and did not oppose the Bill on the ground that sufficient provision was not made for the spread of mass education. When the Bill was passed into law he congratulated the hon. Minister warmly. One of the amendments brought forward by my hon. Friend was that in the Senate there should be communal representation. I gave notice of a similar amendment but that was for eliciting information.

" Sir, the same is the case with regard to the Hindu Religious Endowments Bill. My Friend, Dr. Natesan, most heartily supported it and I will presently read his famous sentence: ' Bravo ! Raja of Panagal.' "

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—" I do not even object to it even now."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" The hon. Member, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu, is presumably saying that to people who may have forgotten it by now."

[28th November 1923]

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—“ Sir, until the 3rd of April 1923 when the last Council was prorogued and finally dissolved there was not one word expressed in this Council disapproving the action of the Ministry or of the party as a whole. I wish to read only three passages from the proceedings of the Council showing the attitude of my Friend, Dr. Natesan, to the Ministry. With regard to the question regarding medical services, Dr. Natesan said that retrenchment was carried on in the wrong direction. As to that, Sir, may I point out that Dr. Natesan himself was one of the Members of the Finance Committee and of the Retrenchment Committee and had ample opportunities to indicate his views? Now, Sir, I will read out one other passage. This is what Dr. Natesan said in December 1922 when the Religious Endowments Bill was introduced :

‘ As with the other Bill, the Bill to regulate State Aid to Industries, it required a people’s Minister to introduce salutary changes in the administration of and in the application of the surplus funds of the various religious endowments. . . . Now our Minister having the support of the people behind him, has thought it necessary not only to put his religious house in order but also make it useful to the public as in days of yore when our people religiously inclined to attain their salvation established not only educational institutions but also provided sanitary, medical, maternity, child welfare and other relief especially water-supply.’

“ Later on he says, Sir,

‘ Thanks are due to those that gave us the Reforms for we are progressing politically and economically ; and our immediate thanks are due to the statesmanship and the foresight of His Excellency Lord Willingdon who gave us our popular Minister and our worthy President.’

“ Sir, this was in December, four months before the House was prorogued. Then, Sir, I go to March 1923 when the budget discussion came up and this is what my friend said on an objection raised by Dr. U. Rama Rao regarding the grants for medical institutions :

‘ If he (referring to Mr. Rama Rao) had the portfolio, I am sure, many of the existing medical institutions would have been closed long long ago. Sir, in this Council, no one excepting you, Sir, and my revered leader, Sir Tyagaraya Chettiyar, commands so much respect, so much confidence of the Council and possesses so much tact as our Minister for Local Self-Government. It is on account of his personal pleading and personal influence that the Medical department got at least this much grant. He pleaded for a 50 per cent grant for local bodies. A sum of Rs. 50,000 is granted to the medical institution for women at Vellore instead of ourselves opening an institution for want of funds.’

“ Sir, I will only refer to one other passage and that is in April 1923 when we in this House parted last. This is what he said :

‘ Sir, Mr. President, I thank you very much for having allowed me to speak. I will only say : “ Bravo ! Raja of Panagal ! ” The whole Presidency was seething with rage ; our religion was thought to be interfered with ; our maths were supposed to be insulted ; our temples were imagined to be plundered ; and the wrath of the Gods of Heaven was invoked upon the hon. the Minister’s head. Questions intricate and puzzling were put to him ; but they were replied with learned ease. Over six hundred amendments were gone through in this House successfully, thanks to our party whips ; and the solidarity of our party has been proved beyond doubt. . . . Before I sit down, Sir, I wish to express my hearty congratulations to the hon. the Minister.

“ Thus, Sir, the House will see that whatever may be the opinion of my hon. Friend of the Ministers in the beginning of the Council or in the second year, just at the closing of the Council we find him warmly congratulating the Minister and the party for their many services to the country.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ May I ask my hon. Friend just one question ? Is the hon. Member not aware of the internal dissensions of the party at more than one conference in which the resignation of the hon. the Raja of Panagal was under discussion ? ”

28th November 1923]

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"I am certainly coming to that, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Before we go further I would like to utter a word of warning to hon. Members. My control over the House is very, very limited, limited by the Rules and the Standing Orders. I wish only to say this. We began with the Ministers and Transferred subjects, then went on discussing the Reserved subjects, then proceeded to discuss the position of the several parties, then to discuss my good old friend, Sir Tyagaraya Chettiyar, quoting his previous and present sayings and so on. Not content with that if we are going to discuss the internal squabbles of parties, it is a matter for consideration where all that will end. I have no objection to the House discussing all these things. I have almost given up the idea of controlling the discussion (laughter). I found last evening that any attempt to confine the discussion to the relevant issues was becoming increasingly impossible. Whatever other merits dyarchy may have, easy workability certainly is not one of them; and the task of the President under that scheme of distinguishing one set of subjects and another is extremely difficult. If hon. Members want to discuss what all took place inside a particular party, they may by all means do so. But I will only submit for general consideration that we are going a great deal wide of the main issue and at this rate I very much fear we may end in discussing something which has nothing to do with the Ministers."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"After your remarks, Mr. President, I should like to explain my position. Sir, some of us have been attacked of inconsistency on the ground of our published speeches here. Inconsistency is a charge affecting our character and hon. Members who make that attack should give full allowance for the sentiments expressed by us in private to them and to their leaders at the private conferences and elsewhere. We regard this as an attack on our character and we say that whatever we did then within the limits of party discipline should not now be brought against us unless they are also going to bring in everything that happened in private. If you, Sir, think that that line of argument need not be pursued, I leave it there. My utterances on the Ministry are well known and publicly made and hence not unknown to my hon. Friend, the Member from Chittoor."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I do not think that the hon. Member, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu, was referring to the private expressions of opinion of the hon. Member, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi. He was only referring to the proceedings of the Council."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"I complain, Sir, that the attack is unfair. For while we are within a party there are certain limits within which we can exercise our individuality. If we go out we will be called rebels from the party. If after carrying on the criticism to a certain extent we remain quiet, that is taken advantage of and we are all interpreted here as having absolutely, unreservedly, acquiesced in all that the Ministers have done and on the basis on what we, as party men, consistently with the principles of honour held in public life, did or did not do in this Council, we are now accused of inconsistency and that we are pursuing this course on account of personal disappointments and matters of that kind; I say it is a most unfair attack."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"I am very sorry that my hon. Friend should think that I was going to say anything affecting him or his character. One way of supporting the motion was by attacking the party and it was in

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

[28th November 1923]

reply that I intended to refer to the definite attitude taken by the party in regard to the University Act and other measures. I was going to reply to my Nationalist and Swarajist friends that up till the 3rd of April all the acts in the Council were of the party and no responsibility could be fixed upon the Ministers for them. The stand that I propose to take is this. The motion which the Mover intended in a narrow sense as an indictment direct against the Ministers has been availed of by the Swarajists and Nationalists to attack the work of the party in the previous days. I wish to say that so far as the party's record is concerned, it is unblemished. The Ministers have done nothing except with the support of the members of the party of whom Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar was one. I only wish to say, Sir, that for all that have been done during the last Ministry the whole party, and not the individual Ministers, are responsible, and in condemning the Ministers we are condemning a record which has been very warmly appreciated by one of the Members now sitting on the Opposition bench. It is not my purpose to go into the differences that have arisen since the 3rd of April. But I only request hon. Members before giving their vote to look upon the motion not merely as a censure motion upon individual Ministers but upon the record of the party as a whole including the members of the party who now sit in the Opposition. If those members who were present in the last Council and those who are newly returned to this Council, belonging to the non-Brahman party, are prepared to say that our resolution on communal representation, and the Government Order regarding it was a sad sin, let them by all means vote in favour of the resolution. If they feel that the resolution of my hon. Friend, Mr. Tangavelu Pillai, urging for the appointment of Selection Committees for admission of students into Government Colleges has been wrongly accepted by this Council, by all means let them say so and vote in favour of the motion. If they say that the Religious Endowments Bill was an egregious blunder of the party in power, let them vote for the motion. If they realize that the University Act was a similar blunder, let them support the proposition before us. But if they are convinced that the party, as a party, has a bright record of work behind it, that the Ministers were only carrying out the party's mandates, then I say that every member who claims to be non-Brahman and a member of the party should vote against the motion."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, when a vakil begins to attack the other side vakil we know where his case stands. We have heard, Sir, many speeches from this House; most of them were on one side. Now we have heard two speeches from the opposite side and what do we find? Only an attack on the other side vakil and nothing about the merits of the case itself. We are now concerned with the confidence enjoyed by the Ministry and not with the character or with the past record of the persons who might have brought the motion before the House. The question is not whether my hon. Friend, Mr. Reddi, was with the Ministry three months ago or not. That is not the issue. We have got to decide here whether we approve of the things done by the Ministry during the time they have been in power and if that record commends itself to the hon. Members, they are certainly bound to support the Ministry and vote against the motion. If, on the other hand, they are not satisfied with the record, they are bound to vote for the motion and against the Ministry."

28th November 1923] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

1-15 p.m. “That is the position. Now that personal questions have been raised by more than one speaker, I shall clear myself so far as I am concerned. I was never a member of the South Indian Liberal Federation which is the political body of the party which is supposed to be in power. Within three months after the formation of the last Council I tried to form an opposition of non-Brahmans. The communal feeling with regard to appointments was strong and at that time combination with Brahmins was looked upon with suspicion. So I thought it would not be either expedient or proper to form an opposition in which both the Brahmins and non-Brahmins would combine, and I tried to form an opposition with non-Brahmins only. About a dozen of us met and actually formed ourselves into an opposition but one or two were influenced by the Ministers who had and who will always have a lot of patronage in their hands. That influence took away one or two members from us, and one or two others thought that it would not be safe to be in an open opposition. So, that opposition died. From that date I never said that I belonged to any party.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“Sir, the Opposition did not die, nor did the party die, but it dwindled in numbers.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“It might have dwindled in numbers, but some of my friends who formed that Opposition thought that it was better to take some Brahmin gentlemen into it. I was not of that view and so I could not be a member of that Opposition. I was in that position, and while I was in that position, I was approached by the Ministers for help. Whenever they wanted my help, I rendered them the assistance that was in my power, and in regard to that help my mind is clear so far as the matters in which such help was asked for is concerned. With regard to other matters, my record would show that there were several matters in which I opposed the Ministers and voted against them, and the division lists would show very well that on several matters I voted against the views held by the Ministers. With regard to one very important matter, for instance, the question of the pay of Ministers, I voted against them in a minority of seven. So, to say that I was a member of the party and was responsible for everything it did and that the fact that I have openly come over to the Opposition shows that I have been disappointed or that I am going to oppose things which I supported before is not speaking the truth at all. My record shows that I have been an independent man all through. I could not form an Opposition, because I could not have sufficient strength to make an Opposition effective in the old Council. That was the position and it was in that position I thought that the best course I should adopt was to help the Ministry whenever they wanted my help and whenever I could conscientiously give it. So I was consistent so far as I was concerned, and I do not think it can be said that I was once with the Ministry and supported several actions of theirs and afterwards seceded from them. I may also say that, as was said yesterday, myself and the hon. Mr. Patro had a talk on the matter whether we should join the South Indian Liberal Federation and both of us came to the conclusion that we should not join it, and it was on that understanding that both of us became members of the Liberal League, and when its meeting was held in Bombay I went there as one of the representatives of Madras to join that League. The hon. Mr. Patro himself wrote to say that he was going there, but he could not do so on account of

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [28th November 1923]

ill-health and subsequently sent a wire to that effect. That is how matters stood, and it cannot be said that I in any way identified myself with the programme of the party and that I am now going back upon it. There are some matters, a few matters, on which I could say that I joined with them, and so far as those matters are concerned I did really work with them and even now I am prepared to work with them or with anybody who may have the same views as I have, so far as such matters are concerned. Well, Sir, my hon. Friend, Mr. Patro, was saying yesterday, speaking on behalf of the Government, that the elections did not show that the party in power has not got a majority and put forward several very startling propositions. He himself said that the party did not put forward any official candidates. Then how is the success or failure of the party to be ascertained? For instance, when such well known members of the party as Mr. Nelliappan Pillai of Tinnevely and Mr. Tulsiram of Madura were defeated, could they still claim the successful candidates as their party men? And then it was said that the nominated presidents were not people for whom they were responsible and at the same time it was said by himself or by some other speaker that there were other nominated presidents who succeeded. Well, Sir, nominated presidents in this Presidency at the present moment are of two sorts. There is one class of people who were nominated by you, Sir, when you were in charge of the department and there are others who have taken the place of those nominated by you and who were nominated by the present Minister. In the case of those who were renominated, there was no difficulty at all and I do not think that the hon. the Minister can claim any credit for the success of those people because in the choice that was made I do not think that he can really claim any share, as the choice was made before he assumed office. But with regard to those whom he himself appointed he was responsible for the choice and he should stand or fall with them. But what do we find? We find that out of the candidates of his choice who stood for election, with the single exception of Mr. Muniswami Nayudu, everybody else has been defeated. And if we take the other side, that is, persons who were superseded, everybody except Mr. Seshagiri Rao has been returned. And if we take the case of Mr. Seshagiri Rao he has got very many more votes than Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu who superseded him. That shows the verdict of the country on the choice made by the Ministry; and that is quite clear.

“Then it was said by Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar that these appointments were no doubt made on party basis, and he asked ‘if nominations are made, how are they to be made except on the party basis?’ A motion to throw open all these presidentships for election came before this House two and a half years back. Then there was a discussion, and the hon. the Minister did not himself speak on behalf of the Government but put forward Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar to speak for the Government. And what he then said will clearly show the difference between the attitude taken by him at that time and that taken by him yesterday. At the time the new reformed Council came into existence the nominations were all in the hands of the Executive Councillors, and then for the first time this principle or system of party Government came in. My Friend Mr. Narasimharaju raised the question that these local boards should be above party, that there should be no question of party in local board administration, and that there should be no patronage with regard to local boards in the hands of a party Government. That was the position taken up by

28th November 1923] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiya]

my Friend Mr. Narasimharaju, and here is the reply given on behalf of Government by Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar :

' Sir, at the very outset, I must enter a caveat against some of the arguments that have been adduced this afternoon, to my very great surprise, by the hon. Member from Vizagapatam, Mr. C. V. S. Narasimharaju. Sir, we are all at one now-a-days in praising the bureaucrats. It was only the other day that the hon. Member from North Arcot had a good word to say of them. To-day my hon. Friend has got a good word to say about the bureaucrats. I cordially endorse that view. I only trust that hon. Members would continue to have these kindly feelings towards the bureaucrats and would remember these encomiums at other times and on other occasions. But is it fair, Sir, that you should decry another department, another part of the Government in your anxiety to praise the bureaucracy? Is it fair, Sir, for you to suggest that the Ministers of the other departments of the local Government will be less fair, will be less able to hold the scales even than the bureaucrats in the past? Is it fair that you should decry any part of the popular Government in your anxiety to praise the bureaucracy? Is it fair for you to suggest that the Minister in charge of Local Self-Government will be less fair or will be less able to hold the scales even? '

" These were the words he uttered then. He said that the Minister for Local Self-Government might be trusted to hold the scales even to see that the party partisanship did not enter into Local Self-Government in the districts and that everything was fair. It is just two and a half years since those words were uttered, and we find an open avowal by the same gentleman, the same mouthpiece employed by the hon. the Raja of Panagal, in regard to this motion. . . . "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Sir, I have not employed him as my mouthpiece, to express the views which I hold on the subject. I have yet my turn, and I am going to speak this afternoon."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Well, Sir, we know that he has been a Secretary. It is said that he is considered to be the Chief Secretary of the Ministers, and he made these statements in an authoritative manner too. Yesterday, hon. Members listened to his speech, and he made it in an authoritative way, and he thought that his arguments were convincing. He has now said that when the patronage is in the hands of the Government, it ought to be used in favour of party men. That was his argument. I would certainly have no objection whatever for party patronage which is in the hands of Government being used in favour of party men. But here is a case of Local Self-Government which ought to be outside party politics. I am not aware whether in England or in any other country Local Self-Government is made a limb of party Government. I have heard that in London and other places the Corporation is something very different from the party in power but still its efficiency has not suffered. This headship or presidentship or chairmanship of these bodies should never be a matter of patronage at the hands of the party in power. But here, unfortunately under the conditions under which we are living to-day, it was probably thought that in a few cases nomination would be necessary, and so a provision was made in the Act to reserve that right to Government. If all the evolutions that have taken place within so short a time could be foreseen, I am sure the House would have been the first to suggest that all these should be thrown open for election and not be entrusted to the hands of a party to be made use of for patronage. So these people, who were nominated by the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government for party reasons, went before the country for election, and what does the country think of them? As I have said already, except Mr. Muniswami Nayudu, every one of the new presidents chosen

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [28th November 1923]

by the hon. Minister for Local Self-Government has been defeated.
1-30 p.m. That shows the confidence the people have in the Chief
Minister and his nominees."

Mr. K. SITARAMA REDDI :—" I am a nominated President, Sir ; I have not been defeated ; I am sitting in the Council."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" That is only an exception which proves the rule."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" That is only one who can rise and say that he still survives."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Sir, may I offer another explanation at this stage ? These nominated presidents have taken charge only recently whereas the old presidents have had time to acquire influence over the electorate ; no wonder they have come out successful. But the recently elected presidents, except in a few cases such as South Arcot and Chittoor, could not acquire that influence, and have not been able to get themselves returned."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" It is not a question of acquiring influence, Sir, by this office. It is a question of commanding the confidence of the people. I did not know that these appointments were made for the purpose of 'acquiring' influence hereafter. I thought that these appointments were given to persons who had already held a position and had the confidence of the people."

At this stage (1-35 p.m.), the Council adjourned for lunch.

The Council re-assembled after lunch at 3 p.m.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR resuming his speech said :—

3 p.m. " Sir, I was speaking about the new principles that have been enunciated by the hon. Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. I have dealt with one already and shall deal with another now. He said yesterday that the municipalities were formed for the purpose of helping the poor people ; the rich people were always against them. So he wanted to take the opinion of the people, but the opinion of the people here would always be against him ; so it is for the Government to override that opinion. That is what it came to. If what he said was correct, it practically goes to the root of all that has been done. Our rulers before us—of course I am talking, Sir, on the assumption that the new Reforms have to a certain extent at least changed the seat of power—the rulers before us, viz., the officials, have been always saying and claiming that we who were talking as representatives of the people were not looking after the interests of the people, that they knew the interests of the people better and so they would decide the matter, and that the voice of the people as expressed by us would count for nothing. That has been their claim hitherto and we have been saying that they were not true, and that the opinions that have been expressed outside are opinions of the people and should be attended to for their benefit. If the theory that has been enunciated yesterday by the hon. Member from Chingleput is accepted, then we go back much to the same position. To defend the Minister is excusable in itself, but unfortunately he wanted to trot out a new theory. Probably, the same theory will be brought forward if another matter is also mentioned, viz., that district board after district board has been asking for the

28th November 1923] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

election of their presidents, and the mouth-piece of the Government who replied to the debate referred to in an earlier portion of my speech said that the Government would ordinarily extend the principle of election in this Presidency. In spite of this, we find that the appointments of these presidents of district boards are still kept in the hands of the hon. the Minister. His reply with reference to this also, I presume, will be no doubt that the district boards asked for election, but they did not know their own interests; the Chief Minister sitting here knows their interests better, and so it is better that he nominates their presidents and not allows them to choose their own. The mouth-piece of the Government said that the principle of election would be extended and would be allowed in as many cases as possible. Still, after two-and-a-half years after the debate, we find the principle extended to only one more district board, after you, Sir, handed over charge of the department to the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government who is supposed to be a popular representative.

"It was said by the hon. Mr. Patro, when he replied on behalf of the Government, that he had enunciated a policy and that that progressive policy was going to bear fruit. What is the policy that he has enunciated? The Elementary Education Act was passed long before his predecessor took charge. It was passed by the Pre-Reform Council; and so the policy was actually laid down not by the hon. the Minister for Education, but by the previous Government. It is only that policy that is being given effect to. And what is the achievement? The achievement is not much to speak of. He says that 13 municipalities have agreed to introduce compulsion in their areas; but in how many of them have they accomplished that fact? There have been resolutions passed by the municipalities themselves with regard to the share of the expenditure that ought to be borne by the Government and the municipalities. I know at least one municipality which passed a resolution in the presence of the hon. the Minister for Education regarding the contribution that ought to be paid by the Government and by the municipality, but that was set aside by the Local Self-Government Department. Then it had to be rectified after repeated requests and representations. We find there, Sir, a matter on which there has been no policy at all. The policy of expansion had already been settled by the Act, and beyond that nothing has been done. Occasionally, a few municipalities were asked to pass some resolutions, and, as these came up before the Government, they considered, and considered, the matter, but did not decide them at all one way or the other."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"In thirteen municipalities free and compulsory education is now being carried on."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"That is no policy at all. I cannot understand, Sir, what is meant by saying that in thirteen municipalities compulsory education is being carried on. Compulsory education is a matter which can be introduced only gradually. Supposing a municipality introduces compulsory education, all that it can do is to impose a cess, raise the money required and also find out the number of schools that is wanted. It does not mean that the moment the resolution is passed, every school-going boy is at school. We have to find boys, we have to provide for boys already receiving education, and we have to find out the number of schools that will be required, and all that. What has been done with regard to these in all these cases?"

[28th November 1923]

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"All these matters have been attended to and a special officer is placed in charge of the municipality which has adopted compulsory education to assist the municipality and the education committee that is appointed under the rules."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"It is not a point of order, Sir, in the first place, and then I do not know if there is such an officer. That does not mean anyhow that the matter has been dealt with fully. As I said, a scheme has to be prepared, the number of schools required have to be taken into account and the number of boys also; then the school-sites, the curriculum, the examinations that have to be conducted; all these matters have to be settled."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Unless all these are settled, Government will never sanction the introduction of compulsory education."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"I say, Sir, I have got close and intimate knowledge of some at least of the institutions in which compulsory education has been passed, and I may remind my hon. Friend that I helped him to get resolutions passed by some of the municipalities, and not in any one of those municipalities has anything been actually done. The hon. the Minister knows it as well as I do. The hon. the Minister himself said that only the policy had been enunciated and that progress was only a matter of time. As I have said, the policy is not the policy of the hon. the Education Minister. It is the policy of the Pre-Reform Government, and the progress that has been made during the last three years is nothing worth speaking of."

"With reference to the Local Boards and Municipal Acts also, the Acts were passed before the Reformed Government came into power. The hon. the Minister said that there were a number of defects in those Acts. Well, they have had three years to rectify these defects. In March last two Bills of a contentious nature were introduced into this Council and they were referred to Select Committees. What has happened after that?"

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"After the Bills were referred to the Select Committee there have been communications from various boards that more amendments should be brought in, and there was this technical question whether, after the Bills had been referred to the Select Committee, we could introduce amendments which have no bearing upon the amendments which have already been embodied in the amending Acts. Hence, Sir, the whole question was dropped at that stage in order that Government might introduce a more comprehensive measure."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Surely, the hon. Member could give all that information in his reply."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"His Excellency the Governor told us in his speech proroguing the last Council that meetings would be held for the purpose of passing these Bills. If, as has been stated by the hon. the Minister, these amendments were absolutely necessary, certainly they could have been passed in June or July. If other representations had been made in the interval, certainly other amending Bills could have been introduced into this Council for the purpose of incorporating those amendments. If there are some more amendments, there is no reason whatever to delay the necessary amendments. It is not that they have had

28th November 1923] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

no time, or no convenience, or that there was pressure of other business. It is a matter of very serious complaint in the country, Sir, that from almost the end of March up to two days back there was no meeting of the Council in this Presidency, even though in other Presidencies they had been able to find time to hold meetings and look to the people's work. That is a matter, Sir, which probably will require some explanation. I do not know whether the Ministers have had a share in the matter, but that is a matter which I do not want to touch now, because it is likely to have reference to the Reserved half also.

"In this connexion, I shall just refer to one other matter which has been already referred to, viz., the remarkable speech made by His Excellency the Governor at the opening of this House. It is, Sir, without doubt a wholesale condemnation of the Local Self-Government as carried on in this Presidency. His Excellency himself stated that various things were bad, that various things were in a very deplorable condition and that they were to be improved. I take it that His Excellency has been in touch with the Ministers and he would have consulted the Ministers before drafting that address. Of course, I am not in the secrets of the Government Secretariat, and I do not know whether in drafting this address the Members of Government are consulted or not. But if we take the precedent of the address of the King in England, I am told, Sir, that it is the Ministers that are responsible for the speech. If that system is followed here also, the Ministers ought to have been responsible for the statements contained in His Excellency's address with regard to Local Self-Government."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :— "This is a matter of some importance. Do I understand the hon. Member to contend that the statements made in the Governor's speech are statements for which the Ministers are responsible?"

3-15 p.m.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"I presume they are, until the contrary is stated."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. the Leader of the House will perhaps have something to say about this."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"I venture to think that it is a matter concerning His Excellency's powers and functions, which is not within the scope of the discussion in this House."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"I do not find fault with anything. All that I say is that the King's address is drafted by the Ministers in England, and I presume that the same thing has been done here. If the hon. the Chief Minister is not prepared to give any information, I do not want to press him to do so. All I can say is that His Excellency has been unequivocal in his condemnation of the Local Self-Government administration. Well, what are the causes of the defects that he has mentioned? He has mentioned a few. Strangely enough, a few days before that pronouncement, Sir, another gentleman, in another place, who has got intimate connexion with the Local Self-Government matters, and whose testimony cannot in any way be questioned by the other side, has also made a statement. I refer to the statement of Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayana-murti Nayudu, made as Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Northern Local Group Conference. He is a gentleman who has been always

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [28th November 1923]

on the side of the Ministers. He has been always sitting on that side, and I do not know whether they claim him as one of their party, or as their dissentient, or as anything else. Well, Sir, this is what he says :

‘ It is contended that the Madras Act V of 1920 is an improvement in all respects on the Act which was superseded in that it has given enormous powers of financial independence, discriminating powers and administrative responsibility. But actual experience has, however, shown that the tendency is more towards centralization than decentralization, and the interference of the Government and of the Examiner of Local Fund Accounts even in matters of minute detail is much resented by the Councils. It is feared that control overdone may be calculated to create a situation destructive of mutual confidence, willing co-operation and emulating enterprise. While advising the local bodies to keep the services efficient by self-reliance and self-help, the measures and methods adopted by them to achieve the objects are relegated to the background, by the issue of orders at once incapable of enforcement and impossible of execution.’

“ I think a greater condemnation than that can hardly be written by anybody, and it comes, Sir, from their own side and from their own ranks. I do not know, after stating that, what attitude my hon. Friend, Mr. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu, is going to take with reference to this motion. But whatever attitude he may take with regard to this motion, his opinion about the administration of this department which has been entrusted to the care of the Ministry is very clear.

“ It is the hon. Mr. Patro, Sir, that took credit for doing a lot of things for the village. He said he was responsible for improving the position of the village officials, for introducing the village panchayats, for introducing the village munsifs’ courts, for the forest panchayats and what not. Well, Sir, that the Ministers were responsible for improving the rural conditions was the statement made by him and he enumerated a number of improvements. But I say, Sir, that for none of those things was the Ministry responsible; every one of those improvements belongs to some other department: the village officers are under the Revenue Department; the village panchayats and the village munsifs are again under the Revenue Department; and the forest panchayat is under the Forest Department. That is what the truth is. The only thing under the hon. the Minister for Education is the village school, and what is the position of the village school? Well, Sir, I have heard that several taluk boards on account of financial stringency have had to close some of the village schools. That is the thing the Ministry have to their credit. Well, what is the reason for the financial difficulty, Sir? These local bodies were put on their legs by a bureaucrat who was in the service for about 35 years. The Bill was passed in a Council where the representative element was not so much in evidence. Well, Sir, after that Bill was passed, the question of finance had to be considered, and a Committee was appointed to consider the relationship between the Government and the local bodies, and that Committee reported. By this time, the Reforms came; the Ministry came into power: what is the result? We find, Sir, in order after order the Ministers trying to bring the local bodies back again under the control of the Government. We find a Government Order issued inquiring the opinion of the people as to whether a certain control which was vested in the Government can be handed over to the Collector; there is another Government Order asking whether references to the Government may not be sent through the Collectors; then there is a third Government Order entrusting appeals from the orders of the local board presidents and municipal chairmen to the Collector, and the presidents of other local bodies.”

28th November 1923]

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ May I know whether these are merely inquiries or whether they are orders passed ? ”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ These are Government Orders issued, Sir, asking for representations before confirmation. A Government which asks for information on these issues is supposed to have considered, at least provisionally, whether these matters are right or not. But when the hon. the Minister found the opposition was very great, he referred the matters to the Advisory Committee, and the Advisory Committee by a very large majority declared ‘ these things won’t do ’. Then he had to give them up. That is how things were dropped. So that is the sort of thing the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government wanted to do with reference to the independence of the local bodies.

“ The nominations are in his hands. With regard to the nominations, many things can be said. As regards nominations of minorities and depressed classes, something has been said already by the representatives of the various interests. I only want to give one instance. In making nominations to a taluk board newly constituted, Sir, three brothers belonging to one and the same undivided family were all nominated as members. That is how nominations have been made. That speaks for itself.”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ May I know whether they were already members of the old boards that were bifurcated later on ; I mean, whether they were elected members of such boards ? ”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ I do not know anything of the old boards or new boards. I find three members belonging to one undivided family nominated as members.”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Sir, there is a convention that elected members of taluk boards should as far as possible be nominated. Sir, it may have been that in some cases two or three brothers may have been elected, and that when the board was reconstituted they might have been nominated.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ They are three brothers from the same family who have been nominated, and I leave it to the House to judge whether the explanation given is a sufficient one or not.”

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“ May I know the name of the taluk board ? ”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ Mannargudi Taluk Board, I believe, it is.

“ Then, Sir, with regard to the financial position of the local bodies, what has been done by the Member in charge ? As a matter of fact, till last November nothing was done and everything was in a chaos. Distribution was proposed to be made on the recommendation of a committee which took a lot of trouble to examine the matter, but no principle enunciated by it has been wholly accepted. On the repeated questioning of the Finance Department the matter was taken over, and those hon. Members who were in the last House may remember that in March last the hon. the Finance Member made a statement here that more money was being given to the local bodies, that some of the best brains in the Council would be appointed to look into how the money could be best distributed among the local boards, that thereafter there would be no further difficulty with reference to their financial

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [28th November 1923]

stability and all that. That arrangement is still to come. But in the meanwhile we are having district retrenchment committees with the Collector and some other people going into the question of the expenditure of each local board in each place. That is not what we wanted. The proposal was to decide the question of division of expenditure between the local boards and the Government. The matter to be decided was how best the money that is available to be paid from the Government coffers can be distributed among the local boards. What we are going into is another inquiry altogether. Well, Sir, the local boards are in a deplorable condition; they are not able to make any progress, they are not able to form any programme of expansion, because they do not know how they are going to be treated by the Government. The Government have already expressed, through the mouth of the hon. Member for Chingleput, that party interests are being considered in the matter of nominations to local bodies. I do not know whether party interests will play a part in the distribution of grants also. If that is so, we do not know where we shall stand. That is the position to which we have come. Well, Sir, that is the record which the Ministry has with reference to local self-government, and I have already said with reference to education that it has been no better.

“I have to say a few words about excise. A Bill was introduced in connexion with it; but instead of taking opinion on it, 3-30 p.m. much time was wasted on it. Indiscriminate orders were issued and all sorts of things were done which probably would require inquiry. A valuable opportunity was actually lost, and we are now as we began. Thus, in that direction also there has been no progress. That is really the achievement of the party. It is on that question that we should vote to-day. It is on that issue that we have to concentrate our attention to-day. Whether there is any other definite policy by any one else is not the question at all. As I said, these are the achievements of the Ministers and it is on that I very much hope the hon. Members of this House will vote to-day.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“Mr. President, if I intervene in this debate, it is solely and simply with a view to correct certain misapprehensions which have crept into the statements made by some hon. Members from various parts of this House. The hon. Member from Chittoor gave an undertaking, which I think he more or less scrupulously kept, not to tread on the Reserved Half. But in the nature of things it was difficult for other Members succeeding him to keep up the undertaking.

“In the first place, reference has been made by more than one hon. Member of this House in regard to the part played, or supposed to have been played, by the Ministers in the matter of suggestions for nominations of hon. Members of this House. As this is a matter which involves the exercise of prerogative by His Excellency the Governor, a prerogative which he exercises according to his pleasure, I think I have a right, and owe a duty to this Council, to explain the position generally.

“Under the Government of India Act, the right of nominating Members to the Council is vested entirely in His Excellency the Governor. He is entitled to take advice from whomsoever he likes. On the last occasion there was no definite portfolio and he, I take it, consulted such of the gentlemen

28th November 1923] [Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar]

as he liked to ask. On this occasion there was a regular channel of communication and there was a portfolio entrusted to a Member of Government. And His Excellency exercised his discretion and his prerogative in nominating Members of this Council and acted through the regular constitutional channel. It is due to the chivalry and sense of fair play on the part of the Ministers that they did not interfere in the exercise of discretion of His Excellency and did not at all interfere with the Member in charge of the portfolio who is myself. I think it is rather a matter for congratulation that the Ministers refrained scrupulously from interfering in the least with such a discretion.

"I now pass on to the question of the elections. Various suggestions have been made in regard to the manner in which the elections have been conducted and to the influences that have been brought to bear upon them. Let me remind the House that according to the Government Servants' Conduct Rules employees of the district board are prevented from interfering in any way, directly or indirectly, with the elections. Most careful enquiries have been made. On the 24th of August, two months before the elections, the attention of the District Collectors was drawn to this rule, a memorandum was published, and just before the elections the Government made confidential enquiries of the Collectors as to whether either the Government officials or employees of local bodies were interfering in any way with the elections. I am glad to say that no specific charges were made. In certain cases specific names were mentioned and those names were transmitted to the Collectors with instructions to make enquiries. It is due to the innate political sense of our people that so far no authentic case of any interference has been received. But one thing I would mention. The hon. Member for Chittoor has forgotten that the time for preferring election petition is not yet over. According to the regular procedure, a certain number of days may elapse after the elections are over for filing petitions. And at least till that is over it will not be proper either for him or for any one else to indulge in charges on the course of elections with the possibility of judicial enquiry being set on foot. The Government have also made it abundantly clear that the Collectors have got a right, and they are charged with the duty of preferring election petitions wherever there is a real and general grievance. It therefore seems to me that so far everything that could be done has been done with regard to the elections."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"A question was raised at the outset of this debate which seemed to imply so grave a misconception of the attitude of the Reserved side of the Government in the matter of this motion that I think it is desirable that I should endeavour to define what their attitude is. I need hardly say in so doing that the matter is one of extreme difficulty since we are dealing with the first instance of a vote of this kind under a constitution which has no parallel. I need hardly add that the attitude of the Reserved half of the Government generally is to endeavour to develop what is admittedly a transitional and imperfect form of Government by adding conventions which will tend towards the realization of complete responsibility. Now, the motion before the House is that the existing Ministry have not the confidence of the House, and the question is to what extent, if at all, the Reserved side of the Government and the officials are part of the House for this purpose. The House as at present constituted consists

[Sir Charles Todhunter] [28th November 1923]

of four different classes of members: there are 97 who are elected by constituencies; 18 are nominated non-officials and 6 are nominated officials; and 4 are ex-officio Members. As to the elected members, there can be no question. It is not for me even to suggest to them what their duty is in the matter. But inasmuch as I am discussing the constitutional question and as we have had the authority of Todd on Parliamentary Government quoted to us, I hope it will not be considered out of place for me to ask the House to remember another dictum of that authority, viz.:

'A vote of want of confidence, though justifiable in certain circumstances, is open to serious objection if it be hastily or unreasonably entertained for mere party purposes. For no person has a right to bring forward a resolution of want of confidence or a vote of censure in respect to any Ministry, unless he is prepared to assume the consequences of such a proceeding, and the responsibility of placing the Government in a minority.'

"Now, Sir, I understand that we have at least six parties in this House, of whom one says that 'no confidence in the Ministry does not mean confidence in anybody else'; another says that he wishes the House to vote for the motion and for the rest, like Lord Milner, would damn the consequences; a third does not care a rap whether Perumal or Pedda Perumal rules; a fourth says the only question is whether you wish this nightmare Ministry to continue. It was the hon. Member who gave expression to this last statement that quoted Todd to the House. I ask him to remember what Todd has said upon the subject of pressing a vote of 'no confidence' when those who press it are not prepared to assume the consequences, and to consider the responsibility which such a course involves.

"To come next to the nominated non-officials. The question which was put to me at the beginning of the proceedings suggested that the Government had issued a whip to them to vote in a particular way. The answer to that question was an emphatic negative. I do not know that I need say any more except to assure the House that the nominated non-official Members, if they are the creatures of anybody, are not the creatures of the Transferred side of the Government, nor of the Reserved side, but creatures of His Excellency the Governor alone, and creatures with power to differ in opinion from their creator. They represent special interests and will, I am sure, give the vote which they consider these special interests require them to give.

"I now come to the six nominated officials. As regards these, the position is clearly defined in the report of the Parliamentary Joint Select Committee where it is stated that

'all other official members of the Legislative Council should be free to speak and vote as they choose.'

"That is the understanding on which an official member is appointed, and if one of them is free to vote against his Minister, it seems to me it is clear that he is at liberty to vote for him if he is so minded.

"There remain the four ex-officio members, of whom two are pale shivering ghosts of the old régime trying to preserve, in the midst of cries for progress on all sides and in all directions, the traditions of steady and ordered advance in which they have been brought up. These two are balanced, as the Council are well aware, even in the Executive Council by two non-official gentlemen. It has been said that these four are irresponsible at least to this Council and should therefore remain neutral in a vote of this nature.

28th November 1923] [Sir Charles Todhunter]

On this point again, I would refer to the report of the Joint Select Committee where it is stated that—

‘the Members of the Executive Council and Ministers should not oppose each other by speech or vote. Members of the Executive Council should not be required to support either by speech or vote proposals of the Ministers of which they do not approve nor should Ministers be required to support by speech or vote proposals of the Executive Council of which they do not approve. They should be free to speak and vote for each other’s proposals when they are in agreement with them.’

“Now, what is the present position? The hon. the Ministers are the subjects of attack, not on account of proposals which they are now making, but on account of some which they have already made and which for the most part received the approval, not only of the Government as a whole, but also of a majority of the late Council. It is now suggested that they should be deprived of the support of the Members of the Executive Council when they are attacked by a new Assembly on account of the same proposals, and it has been further suggested that, if the Members of the Executive Council do not adopt a neutral attitude on the present occasion, they will be creating a very difficult position for themselves in the event of the success of this motion and of another Ministry being appointed. I quite agree, Sir, that the position as above stated is a very delicate and difficult one. But after considering it with all the care of which I am capable, it seems to me that the proper conclusion is that the duty of the ex-officio members of the Council is to support the *status quo* until it is altered by a vote of the House. Their position is not the same as, but it is to some extent analogous to, that of the permanent official in England, who may be expected to carry out a policy of free trade to-day and one of protection to-morrow. I say it is not the same, because it is of course open to them to oppose any policy with which they are not in agreement, but it must be evident to everybody that, unless there is a policy of give and take, no progress in the Government would be possible. This is a position for which very high authority can be cited. Thus did not Burke say :

3-45 P.M. ‘All Government, indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act is founded on compromise and barter,’

“And the late Lord Morley, quoting this, tells us that in France

‘such words ought to be printed in capitals on the front of every newspaper and written up in letters of burnished gold over each faction of the assembly and on the door of every bureau in the administration.’

“Is not what he said about France applicable to this country also? I find myself supported by a very high authority in saying that it is. The hon. the Mover in a very illuminating article which he published on Diarchy says :

‘He who wants other people to help him to carry a measure in which he is interested will have to help those others to carry the measures in which they are interested. Mutual help of this kind is an essential feature of Parliamentary life, except in countries in which initiative and referendum play a predominant part.’

“Well, Sir, that is the plan on which we are going to work to-day and on which, as the House is well aware, we have been working for the last three years. It is for the House to say whether, in regard to the Transferred departments, it has or has not been a success. It is perhaps presumptuous of me to offer an opinion. But inasmuch as the hon. the Mover has, in the article which I have already quoted, assured me that I have ‘no following worth mentioning’ it can at least do no harm if I tell the House my

[Sir Charles Todhunter] [28th November 1923]

experience of the results of the last three years compared with the three years which preceded them. The last three years have been a period full of anxieties, which again I cannot describe with a fraction of the eloquence with which the hon. Member has himself described them. Writing in May 1922, he said :

‘ No member behaves as though he has the support of an electoral majority behind him ; no Minister dare assume that accident and good fortune have not had as much to do with his acquisition of office as factors of more legitimate computation. Add to the moral distress of the situation, the empty purses and wrong balances, you have a picture of their sorry plight. Gandhi is a relentless foe ; he drives the screw the whole length through and will not spare a single turn if he gets the chance. If the Ministers keep quiet, they are a costly blunder ; if they wished to do anything and asked for funds (a contingency that they have so far carefully retrained from creating), why then they are another set of plunderers, native parasites more troublesome and more difficult to shake off than unacclimated ones of foreign origin. So far as constructive work is concerned, he has reduced Government to his own level ! It can do nothing ; it is at a standstill’

“ But I ask myself whether it is correct to say that in this Presidency everything was reduced to a standstill. I think I should not be going too far in saying that, if a bureaucratic Government had been in charge during this period, its tendency would have been to draw in its horns as regards all measures of advance and to conserve its resources for the maintenance of the ordinary services and the maintenance of law and order. Far from this having been the case under the conditions in which we have been living it has been a period of incessant activity, incessant endeavour after progress in the departments conducted by the hon. the Ministers. One hon. gentleman challenged me to say that there had been no new appointments created. I have examined the figures, as rapidly as time allowed, of appointments to the Imperial services. There is an excess of about 30 and that excess is entirely attributable to the advance made in the departments of education and agriculture.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I wanted the whole of the gazetted officers.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ I will collect the figures for the hon. Member.

“ More than one hon. gentleman has ridiculed the idea that the transference of one per cent of the expenditure of the Presidency from the Reserved to the Transferred side meant any material change. If the hon. Mr. Patro, instead of saying that there had been a transference of one per cent, had said that in one year the expenditure on the Reserved side had been reduced by 36 lakhs while that on the Transferred side had been increased by 11 lakhs, I think the House would have looked at it differently. If the hon. gentleman had been in the position of the members in charge of the Reserved departments who, with a declining revenue were yet compelled to reduce their expenditure in this way in order that the money might be handed over to the Transferred departments, they would not have thought it a small matter at all. A third hon. gentleman has declared with great emphasis that 2½ years is a long time in the life of a nation.”

. Mr. M. RATNASWAMI :—“ In the history of humanity” (laughter).

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ I thank the hon. Member for the correction. If he considers this period a long time in the history of humanity, I wonder what he would call a short one (laughter). Another

28th November 1923] [Sir Charles Todhunter]

question that has been raised is that of local fund finance. There is much that I could say on that subject, but I think I have said enough on matters of administrative detail.

"I have quoted more than once from the illuminating articles of the hon. the Mover on the subject of Diarchy. May I in conclusion quote him again and revert in so doing to what I said at the beginning of my speech about the responsibility of this House if it is the intention of this motion to displace the existing Ministry while giving no lead as to how they are to be replaced? The words he used were as follows:

'Unless a member is in a position to form an alternative Government or, in other words, is in command of a more or less stable majority of votes, his asking the Ministry to resign could serve no useful purpose.'

"He now says that, if the officials vote, he leaves the diarchical paradox so created to be solved by the liberal statesman who is at the head of the Government. I am sure that, if that is the situation created, His Excellency the Governor will be equal to it, as he would be to any other. But I do venture to ask the House, before they give a vote to this effect, whether it is a proper function of a responsible assembly to devote itself to the setting of diarchical paradoxes for solution."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I wish first to deal with some of the minor issues raised to-day, and then with the major issues which I consider to be of the highest importance, both from the point of view of substantial as well as constitutional progress of this Presidency. There have been one or two personal insinuations made, that owing to some private motive or other, we, that have been supporting the Ministry all through, through thick and thin, have suddenly revolted and tabled this motion. I suppose that the further insinuation is that if this is carried, personal ends would be served. My hon. Friend from Chittoor has assured me that he had no intention at all of attacking me personally, and he said that the remarks and quotations made from the proceedings of this Council were intended to speak for themselves. As I have already said in my opening speech there have been two sections in the old Justice Party, the progressive section and the conservative section. The progressive section stood for reform from within the ranks as long as possible, and it is only when they found that all attempts at reform from within were hopeless and also when some of them found that they themselves were not regarded as a desirable element by the official leaders, that the cleavage became open. It may be that for the people who do not read newspapers or keep in touch with the current political events, this thing comes as a surprise. But for the men who have been in the party, who have been attending conversations and conferences, the development which has created this new situation in this Presidency to-day, could not come as a surprise. It is all very well for the hon. Members associated with the Ministers now to get up and say that I was a very good boy, that it was a great surprise to them to see me where I happen to be at this moment and to recall with simulated conservative gratitude what they considered the past in which I co-operated with them so much. They have explained that I was a prominent general and that at a critical moment I have left them. To say because I now move this motion I am inconsistent is the very negation of party loyalty and party organization. I hope this aspect of it will be remembered especially by men who were till

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [28th November 1923]

some time ago my colleagues and that they will not try to confuse the issue to-day by raising this dust of consistency and inconsistency.

"The other point I wish to deal with is that the hon. the Ministers in their defence have been blaming diarchy for the defects pointed out in their administration. There was a time, not so very long ago, when hon. Member after hon. Member and Minister after Minister of the party went about crying that diarchy had become a great success in this Presidency. It seems to me that the tune in which they are now singing is not the same as that which they sang some time ago. If the diarchic system which has remained entire has operated in a different manner from what it did two years ago, then I hope the responsibility for it should be borne by the hon. Ministers themselves since it is not the system which has changed, but it is the way in which they have exercised their power which has created this stir. Now let me recall one or two instances. My hon. Friend the Law Member spoke of the chivalry of his Colleagues in a matter in which they had nothing to interfere. If not interfering in a matter in which they had no connexion is chivalry, by all means let them have it. Let me point out what happened two or three years ago and what happened recently in connexion with certain appointments. When my hon. Friends, Mr. Justice Venkatasubba Rao and Mr. Justice Devadoss, were appointed, as judges, my hon. Friends, the Ministers, claimed the credit for it from the platforms."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"If in the course of the reply, my hon. Friend wishes to traverse the region of the Reserved
4 p.m. half, I take it, Mr. President, that you would give us a chance to reply to his remarks."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I am not traversing that region at all. I am referring to what the Ministers and their party did in that connexion. I am not in the slightest degree criticizing those appointments or in any way casting reflections on the manner in which the Reserved half discharged its duty. Recently, another appointment of a non-Brahman was made and there was not so much of jubilation and the party never claimed any credit for it. The inference is obvious.

"My hon. Friend the Leader of the House quoted an old article of mine on diarchy and he pointed out how I had recognized the difficulties of the system. My hon. Friend should know that I wrote not only one article but several articles and he might have anticipated that I would write some more. There is no finality about statements of this kind, especially if articles are to be based on the real working of the system and the experience and the facts revealed from time to time. While I admit all those difficulties, I am not prepared to say that because of that, any Ministry and every Ministry should be regarded as having done the best possible thing under the circumstances. If that view is taken, where is responsibility? I will put this to my hon. Friend, the Leader of the House: does he or does he not believe that under the diarchical system, an element of responsibility is introduced? If he believes that responsibility is introduced, of whom and to whom? Obviously the Ministers are responsible to this Council. But supposing on a Motion of No Confidence,—I use it according to the strict letter of the law—officials and nominated members together constituting something like 37 out of the 128 Members in this House should take sides and that their votes also count for confidence, then all that I can say is that we

28th November 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

are playing into the hands of those who always hold that these Reforms are a gilded sham. The words of His Gracious Majesty were quoted and widely quoted. So far as the principle is concerned, the interpretation put as to what constitutes responsibility and to whom that responsibility is due, will not be taken away under a different set of circumstances. The general elections would be nothing less than a farce if the verdict given there is not going to be taken into account. Out of 128 Members of this House 30 are nominated."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Only 29 are nominated Members."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" To that extent you nullify the verdict of the general elections. Some individual or some combination of individuals need only secure 30 votes out of the 98 that are elected in order to constitute a ministry possessing the confidence of the House according to the extraordinary interpretation which we have just now listened to. I am not at all raising my voice against the other points mentioned by the hon. the Leader of the House. It is perfectly true that the diarchical system contemplates mutual help; but mutual help in the transaction of ordinary business is reasonable but not the kind of help which will nullify the verdict and the significance of elections."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" May I make a personal explanation, Sir? The 29 Members whom the hon. the Law Member referred to include nominated non-officials and officials. I expressly said when I referred to the question of mutual help that I was referring only to the four—now three—ex-officio Members."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" I quite see that. It is well known that the creature may have the right to differ from the creator but he generally prefers to worship the creator. That is essentially a feature of human psychology and this essential feature is not likely to be absent from those classes who, owing to their ignorance or depressed or backward condition, or because of their being numerically small, might not get representation in the usual way by fighting the electoral battle but have to come through the good graces of His Excellency the Governor aided by the Member in charge of the portfolio. I may, therefore, put it that whatever may be the theory, the creatures will continue to worship their creator especially if they realize that their subsequent renomination also will depend on the good grace of the same being. Then, with respect to the official Members, it is perfectly true and if my hon. Friend had quoted me at greater length from the articles that he had studied, evidently with greater care than I have ever bestowed in writing them, he would have found that while the theoretical right of officials to vote as they like is recognized in almost every country, the convention has grown up for the officials to vote together. I am not saying that the convention is good or bad, but I take facts as they are. On only one occasion was the diarchy made patent in this House and that was when the late lamented Sir K. Srinivasa Ayyangar introduced his Irrigation Bill, when the Ministerial half more or less parted company from their Executive Colleagues. But I have never known of a single instance in this House when the officials as a body did not rise to support the hon. the Leader of the House. Nor have I known of a single case in which that further diarchical paradox of a subordinate of an hon. Minister getting up and speaking or voting

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [28th November 1923]

against the Minister. In substance, therefore, my contention is true that if the theories, or rather the defence, of the hon. the Leader of the House ought to be accepted, then we have gone very very far indeed in justifying every one of the criticisms that have been levelled against the scheme by my friends of the Congress party. If we are going in this House to give our final sanction to the views thus expressed regarding the unreality of the whole scheme and its being essentially bureaucratic in character, by all means have that satisfaction. But we and our friends associated with us have to see what course we should follow. Sir, any 30 people who could come in by general election would form a Government according to the scheme, being in a working majority. I am not talking mathematics but I am talking politics. If we analyse, there are so many special electorates which have been introduced for the defence of certain interests more than for generally influencing policies."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. The hon. Member's discourse has been so very interesting to me personally, that I have had great difficulty in rising; but I would point out we are not dealing with the question of the merits or demerits of the diarchic system."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I have to point out, Sir, that I wish that this motion be judged by the votes of the elected Members whatever the result may be. If I am not allowed to do so, it would be no use my pressing it any further. The terms of my Resolution are that the Ministry as now constituted is against the weight of the verdict delivered at the general elections and if I get that majority I claim that the Ministry must go and that is why I am driving home this argument. If it is further considered that in this general election are included members who come from special electorates, landholders, Chamber of Commerce, the University, etc., then the power of the general electorate, the degree to which the general mass in this presidency can influence the conduct of affairs becomes minimized almost."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD:—"May I ask the hon. Member whether the landholders' votes are not required by him?"

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I want not only the votes of my hon. Friends, the representatives of the landholders, but, if possible, those of the hon. the Executive Councillors also. I am only pointing out the constitutional significance of us, representatives of the people, including the members of the special interests acquiescing in this kind of strange doctrine. My proposition is clear. I do not care whether technically this motion is carried in this House or not. If I get an electoral majority, I certainly will be satisfied. My hon. Friend the Leader of the House told us that we were presenting the statesmen at the head of affairs with a diarchical paradox."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I make a personal explanation, Sir? It was the hon. Mover who said that he proposed to present the diarchical paradox, and I was simply quoting him."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"If the idea is that we are doing this in an irresponsible manner, I beg to disabuse him of that idea immediately. My hon. Friend may be perfectly right in saying that nobody has a right to move a motion like this unless, considering all the circumstances, he or any of those

28th November 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

associated with him or those who are going to be neutral are more or less assured—we are neither prophets nor astrologers—that a stable alternative government would be formed.

“Let us look, Sir, for one moment at the composition of this House. Progressive parties of various degrees have been returned—
4-15 p.m. I claimed that, and I do claim it again—in a very large majority. What may be called the Tory members of the Justice party stand by themselves facing the condemnation both in this House and elsewhere with their rump members. I ask, Sir, is it not possible for hon. Members of this House to create from amongst themselves a Cabinet that will, under the circumstances, receive the general support of all progressive groups? If any one says it is not possible, if any one believes it, I think he would be guilty of two prepossessions, each one of which would be enough to prove that he lacks vision, if not also sympathy. One of these is that we are irresponsible and that not one of us puts forth any constructive policy. This is not true. Even my friends the Swarajists, who were referred to as butterflies, who have come here to wreck the Council, would be wrecking in real actual day-to-day politics their own wings and nothing more. After all, the Madras Presidency has enough of practical politicians.

“What my hon. Friend would like to know is what other alternative we have got to propose. I was going to deal with it. I was going to inform the House that, on a famous occasion, Mr. Gladstone declared that the business of the Opposition is to oppose. Therefore there is no necessity for any foreigners to come to our aid with any constructive ideas nor alternative policies. A Vote of ‘No Confidence’ is strictly a Vote of ‘No Confidence.’ Hon. Members should vote on that issue; and not on hypotheses regarding the future. I think it was a very wise doctrine. If on an occasion like this, instead of reviewing the present policy of the Ministers and whatever is connected with the conduct of the Ministers, something else is going to be discussed, then there is no meaning in moving the Vote of ‘No Confidence’ Resolution.

“Further, some of us are asked to state what the alternative Ministry will be, and that question, I hope, has been answered by one who is a great believer in constitutionalism and anything more by way of supplementing that answer would be nothing short of impertinence. I am perfectly confident that so far as I am concerned or any party which is associated with this Motion is concerned, the question of the personnel of the Ministry is out of consideration. The object of a stable progressive alternative policy is that the Ministry should in the last degree be an elected one, and I have not tabled this Motion without considering all the aspects of the question.

“Sir, my hon. Friend, the Leader of the House, put it to us that we have been associated with this Ministry for two or three years, and that it would be undesirable that a Vote of ‘No Confidence’ Motion should be passed . . . May I ask him what . . .”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“May I say, Sir, that I said nothing of the kind.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—“I am very glad if the hon. the Leader of the House has not done so. It saves me from a very difficult and delicate situation.

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [28th November 1923]

"Now coming to the subject, we have every right to move this Motion after a General Election. It is usual and a routine procedure both in England and on the Continent. To those, Mr. President, who told us that in this House there seemed to be so many groups and asked us how business was going to be conducted without a stable majority, might I retort that the present Ministry does not command anything like a stable majority? If one Ministry loses that support all my hon. Friends the Executive Councillors would nominate both officials and non-officials to enable that Ministry to have a stable majority. Then what objection is there on earth to some other alternative Ministry? It may also command the confidence of the elected majority, claim the same support and same consideration."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :--"May I ask the hon. Member if he did not say in an interview that the Vote of 'No Confidence' in the present Ministry does not mean a Vote of Confidence in anybody else."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :--"I repeat it, because, after the Ministry had been formed, notice of a Motion of this kind was given. Am I wrong?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :--"That is what I understood."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :--"Sir, I do not want hon. Members who are here as representatives of the people and who are entrusted with the extraordinary responsibility, firstly to their electorate, and secondly of co-operating in working a system which is a difficult system—I suppose I have written more about it than anybody else in India—to feel that in tabling this Motion or deciding to vote for this Motion we did not show more circumspection or caution. Whatever may be the implications of my views, grant for one moment—I would put it tentatively and I do not think Sir Charles Todhunter would dogmatise on a very important subject of this kind—that his argument is unassailable, what would be the effect if any Ministry, however strongly constituted, would continue and should continue and should never be destroyed, and the same three Ministers come here to lead this Council? They too according to the same argument and with this kind of adventitious support would not command the . . ."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :--"I am very sorry to interrupt the hon. Member. I do not think he is repeating my argument correctly. My statement was that a nominated non-official might vote as he pleased but that the three ex-officio Members would support the *status quo*."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :--"I am very glad that the hon. the Executive Council Members are prepared to support any alternative policy. Their support seems to be strictly a mechanical thing (laughter) That is something."

"I have said that whatever may be the theory in practice, it will be found that they will come in support of what is called the *status quo*. Now, if these arguments are granted, the question that I would put to the Chief Minister is whether the old Ministry could not have dealt with the Vote of 'No Confidence' Motion more honourably, and then whether for the sake of official adjustment and greater harmony among themselves they could not have explained the manner in which the Ministry should be reconstructed with a Tamilian element in it."

"Then again, our charge is not with respect only to the Bills and measures which were supported by us, but it rests on different grounds—

28th November 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

grounds which could not have been raised in the last Council on account of the fact that the Ministry was just formed and that the feeling that we should support it was very strong. But afterwards we found that the Ministers did not declare what their policy was”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“The Ministers have declared their policy already. They declared their policy on the 1st of July.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“I humbly request your protection against this obstruction. This will reduce the debate to the level of a dialogue.

“Sir, I was going to observe that even in the last session there was a certain amount of discontent against the hon. the Chief Minister. You will remember, Sir, that some of my hon. Friends actually tabled Motions proposing the reduction of the Ministers’ salaries. Sir, it has been stated that this was due generally to the discontent displayed by some of my friends from the Tamil country. But the Members of the old Council were under the impression that after the new Council a new Ministry would be formed and therefore the matter was allowed to remain where it was. I have only generally to point out one or two things to show how we are fighting for the principle of responsible Government. Yesterday one of my hon. Friends in a speech charged me with insincere aims and said what must be kept in view was, not the vote for this Ministry or that Ministry, not even the vote for a particular party, but the whole cause of responsible Government and constitutional advance.

“Sir, let us see the wise doctrine about the administration of local Governments that was enunciated by my hon. Friend Dr. Subbarayan at the last budget meeting. He declared that the administration should be so carried on as to prepare the people for the discharge of larger responsibilities and for the preparation of a larger expansion of self-government in our country as a preparation for Swaraj. But what do we see? A large number of presidentships in our local bodies have not yet been thrown open to election. We thought it was due simply to a kind of mischance. But no. Yesterday the doctrine was enunciated that there was nothing wrong in appointing party men to those places. This is practically an admission that the ‘Spoils system’ has been adopted. Mr. President, if certain of these places are to be given on this principle, there is no motive provided for throwing open places for election at all. When a large number of nominations are in hand and a large number of the followers of the party are given these nominations, the greater will be the power of the party—power mechanically developed. Now, is that a sound democratic principle, and is it going to prepare this country for responsible Government either now or in the near future? Sir, for every non-Brahman whom you thus patronize you are depriving the claims of 30 to 35 non-Brahman members of the district or local boards. Is not that injuring the non-Brahman interests? By the appointment of a single man to the detriment of the right vested in some 45 individuals, non-Brahmans as well as Brahmans, you are doing injury to the cause of non-Brahmans also, and you are taking the life out of these district boards.

“I wanted to refer to some other subjects. But, in view of the statement made by the hon. the Law Member I am not prepared to say that the whole matter is not or will not be *sub judice*, and therefore I refrain. As regards nomination I reiterate that they have not been made in

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

[28th November 1923]

the spirit in which they ought to have been made according to law. They were intended to help the poor and the helpless, whereas you have been nominating people who stood and failed in the elections. I can quote instance after instance to prove this. People who can command votes are in greater favour than those who, because they cannot command votes, require the special protection of the Government. This is neither democratic nor, excuse me, Sir, even humanity, if you will permit me to say so.

"Sir, as you have already rung the bell and, as I know that you would not like me to take up the time of the Council any more, I will just say one or two words before I sit down.

"This morning in a very important and moving speech my hon. Friend, Dr. Subbarayan, referred to certain sentiments entertained by the hon. Leader of the Justice party. Member after member got up and in the face of the leader said that, so far as this question went, they did not recognize his leadership. It seems to me, Sir, that this is another instance of the dual leadership which has come about as a result of the type of methods which this party has been adopting for a long number of years. On a question which all the world over would be regarded as one concerning national honour, for a big party to say that they differed from their leader is another paradox which is worse than any which diarchy can contemplate."

"It has been asked, 'have you ever tabled any policy?' Hon. Members might look to all the resolutions that appeared on the agenda paper last year (many of them were not taken up) and also the interpellations and then they can see in what direction we were moving. It was at Trichinopoly that I declared my views and I still hold those views.

"My hon. Friend from Chittoor seems to think that, if this motion is carried, the non-Brahman party will disappear. With all due deference to him, let me say that the non-Brahman is of a bigger, more important and more progressive calibre than the old Justice non-Brahman and that all non-Brahmans do not belong to it. He also said that the only alternative to the present Ministry was some Ministry composed of Brahmans. During the last Council, Sir, to the great regret of many, the Brahmans, as such, formed the Opposition. To-day that is not the case. It has been absorbed and substituted . . ."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"If I remember, two or three non-Brahmans Messrs. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Sivasankara Pillai and Narasimha Raju sat on the Opposition benches."

MR. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"Sir, I will qualify my statement by saying 'in the main'. That contingency has disappeared and now there are in this House non-Brahmans of different sections who together form a large enough and big enough group to command the attention of this House and to be able to help in the direction of progress. Sir, why was this red-herring of the Brahman element introduced? The Brahman members have declared that they were not non-co-operating with the non-Brahman Ministry and that they were not for the official loaves and fishes. Whatever may be the agency that this Council established, what they required of that agency was that it should, for the good of the country, be genuinely honest and democratic, that it should not surrender the national right a bit to the bureaucracy and that it should proceed without embarking on unconstitutional methods. That is what is required.

28th November 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

"Sir, I have done. My address, in express terms, declares that the present Ministry, as constituted, is against the weight of the verdict given in the general election. Let not the elected members be misled. Nothing will happen to them if they vote against the present Ministry. Their votes will always be required in the future whatever they may do now. Let them realize that the very principle of responsible Government is at stake. If the Ministry is not going to be responsible to the elected members, to whom else would they be responsible? It is in this specific matter that the present Reform Act differs from the Act under which the old Council worked. If, having the power of enforcing responsibility in us, we do not employ it against a Ministry which secured only its party interests in the administration of the departments entrusted to its care, especially local boards, if, after it has been disapproved of by every impartial man in this Province, irrespective of party or group, if, on such an occasion like this, responsibility is not enforced, I ask, would not the critics of India say 'what is the good of giving them responsibility? They have not got the character to enforce responsibility.' If you think that the existing evil is preferable to an unknown one, would not the bureaucracy be better off than the present irresponsible Ministry? I say so because the bureaucrat being safe in his position, his tenure being secure, has no motive and has no need to enter on these manipulations and manoeuvres which have been the cause of the real dissatisfaction amongst a large number of non-Brahmans in our midst.

"It has been said that the Ministry only carried out the wishes of the Legislative Council and therefore the Members were responsible. No man versed in constitutional practice will say that. The Ministers are the leaders and they must take the risk. They have got the power and therefore they have got the responsibility. They cannot say that they are only sarishtadars to carry out the wishes of the Council and shirk responsibility. Sir, the Joint Committee will soon be visiting this country and they would like to know whether this small measure of responsibility, which has been placed in the hands of the elected members, has ever been employed and if they find that it has never been employed they would come to one of two conclusions only. They will take it that the Indian character is so bankrupt that he cannot assert his right to enforce responsibility and that he is not in a position to employ it either to his own advantage or to the advantage of the country or humanity; or that the Indian Minister is so good and so benevolent that he can be expected to govern the country for the good of the people even if there is no constitution at all.

"The issues I have raised are higher than politics. They touch the higher regions. One of my hon. Friends said, 'let us search our political consciences on this occasion'? Search them. Tell me, is it possible for any self-respecting legislature to give its confidence to a party which has never treated its right to govern as a sacred right which has to be discharged in full, in spirit and in letter.

"This morning in a speech by an extraordinary lawyer who did not blush to trot out to the Council, we are asked, 'is it their purpose to raise their voice against the leadership of any particular individual'—an individual who, after creating division among the party and after witnessing the dissatisfaction that prevailed among the party executive, refused to consent to mend it, who in the district board administration avowedly accepted the principle of exploiting the system and who, for the sake of preferring this individual to that and pushing this man over that man, has deprived the non-Brahman Councillors

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [28th November 1923]

of their right to elect men of their own choice to be their presidents and who has not done anything either to respect the people's will or to extend the people's right. That is not the test of any Ministry which calls itself democratic. Government vested the right in the people and that is as it should be. If the Reforms are to be carried through to success, we must enforce responsibility. The bureaucracy itself was a good Government, and has it not been the one justification that has been put forward by them? In this country, where the lower classes are not properly looked after, it is only the third man, the disinterested foreigner, who has to be trusted to do justice between class and class and individual and individual. Have we advanced one inch, one step, beyond that by the constitution of our Ministry? If we have not, then I say, you must vote, in the sacred discharge of your duties as representatives of the people, for this vote of 'No-Confidence'.

"Once again, I assure the hon. the Leader of the House that we, who have had either in a small measure or for a small number of years some experience of responsible administration, have not tabled this motion without a careful analysis of the figures of the general election and without any reference to the responsible circumspection of the administration; and that while asking hon. Members to vote for this motion we are not asking, in any irresponsible manner, without doing our best, though we are not astrologers, to see that by some way or another that primary duty of all assemblies and of all cabinets, that of carrying on His Excellency's Government, is fairly guaranteed."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"Mr. President, Sir, we have had a full dress debate on the unique motion before the House.

4-45 p.m.

The motion is unique inasmuch as it is the only one of its kind. It is for the first time that such a motion has been moved anywhere in India. In the debate there has been a splendid display of eloquence on both sides of the House. The pros and cons of the proposition have been pointedly brought before the hon. Members of the House. I admit, Sir, that we have had enough of discussion on the subject. I admit too that there has been enough of denunciation and enough of defence. Sir, notwithstanding these admissions, if, at this stage of the debate, I rise to speak, it is not because I felt that I should add to the literature on the subject, but because I feared that I might be misunderstood if, as the Chief Minister, I had not my say on this motion of vital importance to the very existence of the existing Ministry. The motion, Sir, is a direct challenge to the strength and staying capacity of the present Ministry. It is, in spite of the hon. Mover's apology, a reflection on the exercise of His Excellency's right in nominating the Ministers according to the best of his information regarding the relative positions of parties in this House."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"I rise to a point of order. The hon. the Chief Minister says that, in spite of the apology offered by me, my motion is a reflection on the manner in which His Excellency used his discretion in the choice of his Ministers. Sir, I have already said that if that construction should be put upon it, the whole motion would be out of order. I would be the first to have it cancelled."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Minister says that this motion finds fault with His Excellency for making these appointments. I do not quite see the point of order."

28th November 1923]

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ The implication was that I questioned the prerogative of the Governor in appointing this Ministry.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ There is no question of the prerogative of His Excellency the Governor.”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Not at all, Sir.

“ The result of division on this motion may perhaps be claimed as a standard to gauge the strength of the Ministry ; whether really the vote on this motion can be depended upon as an unfailing test of the relative strengths of the Ministerial party and the Opposition, however, is a different matter.

“ Sir, it must be remembered that in this House, there are the Ministerialists and the Opposition parties and individuals who do not and cannot see eye to eye as much with the Opposition as with the Ministry ; parties and individuals whose views are as irreconcilable to the views of the Opposition as to those of the Ministry. If these parties and individuals vote on this occasion with the Opposition, it is due to the tactical move on the part of the hon. Mover. I congratulate my hon. Friend from my own district on his having tabled a motion so temptingly worded as to serve as a common platform for the support from all the non-Ministerialists, be they Swarajists, Khilafats, or Independents. Could the vote then signify the magnitude of the Opposition ? From the vote on this matter it may not be possible to arrive at a decision as to the strength of the Opposition.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI (seated) :—“ By whom ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I cannot take notice of anything unless the hon. Member rises and speaks.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI (having risen) :—“ I simply asked a question as to the decision which the hon. the Chief Minister referred to and said ‘ By whom ’.”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ The Ministry is only a few days old. At this stage, particularly, in view of the high authority, quoted by my hon. Colleague, the Leader of the House, has the Mover a case for making the motion ? Has it legs to stand upon ? I am afraid, it has not, not even crutches. A cripple can stand upon artificial legs and even the torrential eloquence of the hon. Member for the University could not serve as made-up limbs to the case. He has based his case mainly upon two assumptions :—(1) that the verdict of the electorates as indicated in the recent elections is against the Ministry ; (2) that the Ministerial administration in the past has been a failure.

“ Of these, so far as the first is concerned, it has been repeatedly pointed out by speaker after speaker on this side of the House that the hon. Mover’s estimate of Ministerial strength is erroneous. If the Ministerialists are not in such overwhelming majority as they were in the last Council, they have still a workable majority. There is no justification for the assumption that the verdict of the electorates is against the Ministry. As regards the second assumption it is more serious. It is as gratuitous as it seems to be more or less based on personal prejudice. It is based on incorrect observations, observations made in reckless ignorance or with the deliberate intent to prejudice the Ministerial administration. I wish the speakers opposite levelled their criticisms with a fuller knowledge of details of the administration and with greater sense of responsibility.

[The Raja of Panagal]

[28th November 1923]

“They questioned the delay in filling the district board president’s place in Tanjore and took the Chief Minister to task for nominating the presidents of the Ramnad and North Arcot District Boards. The fact of the matter is that in the case of Tanjore District Board which has asked for the privilege of electing its president and which the Government considered as being fit for having an elected president, some of the taluk boards in the district have been reconstituted during the interval and could not send their representatives to the district board till quite recently. It would have been unfair to the members from these reconstituted boards to allow the election of the president to take place before they could send their representatives to the district board.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“May I know when they were reconstituted?”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“About a month back.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“May I ask if it was not in 1921?”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“No, Sir. They were reconstituted only recently. It would have been unfair to the members who had been returned by these reconstituted boards if the election was held during their absence. In the case of Ramnad and North Arcot District Boards, in order to avoid circuitous procedure, the presidents were nominated so as to come into office on the day on which they vacated their places. If this had not been done, they had to be first appointed as members and then nominated as presidents. As regards the appointment of the presidents of the Kistna and Coimbatore Boards Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Garu and Rao Bahadur Ramalingam Chettiyar were not re-nominated. If the hon. Members had known the facts, they would not have had doubt as to Mr. Ramachandra Rao having ceased to be a member under the provisions of the Local Boards Act by not having attended more than three meetings and that the district board did not pass a resolution in time excusing the absence. Diwan Bahadur Balaji Rao Nayudu Garu, who was at the time the vice-president was appointed president on the recommendation of the Collector, who had been consulted. In the case of the Coimbatore District Board, Mr. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar’s nomination as president was decided upon in 1920 before the introduction of the Reforms, when for special reasons, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar was for the time being nominated. After the expiry of the term the former had to be nominated. The president of the Bellary District Board too was recommended by the Collector of the district.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“May I point out that according to the Act, no time is fixed for excusing such delay?”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“In any case no such resolution was passed by the board.”

Mr. P. PEDDIRAJU :—“May I say, Sir, that such a proposition was never placed before the board by the Vice-President.”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“The Minister is not responsible for that.”

“Reference has been made to the episode of the Chirala Municipality. My hon. Friend from Chingleput has explained the case with his usual eloquence; as he has pointed out the incident was due to the wire-pulling by

28th November 1923] [The Raja of Panagal]

some of the wealthier men of the place to evade municipal taxation. Advantage was taken of the activities of some of the political agitators. I am glad to say that the people of the place are now reconciled to the continuance of the municipality and, if my information is correct, are glad that the municipality was not abolished. Reference has also been made to the delay in the chairman's election of the Bezwada Municipality. The delay in this case is due to a series of technical objections raised by the chairman. These objections had to be examined both by the Secretariat and by the Advocate-General before decision could be taken and that necessarily took time.

"Sir, much has been made of His Excellency's remarks regretting the financial embarrassment of local bodies and offering advice regarding the relations between the non-official authorities and the salaried staffs of the local bodies. The financial embarrassment of the local bodies is due to the increased salaries of the staff and the increased cost of materials for which the Ministry cannot be held responsible. During the current year, however, an allotment of 17 lakhs has been made for wiping off the deficits of the local boards, deficits due to over-spending by those boards during a number of years both before and after the appointment of the last Ministry. It is in the interests of the Local Self-Government that local boards should not give room to complaints on the ground of slackness. After all these local bodies have been entrusted with enhanced powers only recently and it is no wonder if here and there they have made mistakes. But it is the duty of the Government to point out the mistakes to the local bodies and warn them against their recurrence.

5 p.m. "A great deal has been said about the nominations of the presidents and members of the district boards. They were mostly made on recommendations and greatest care was taken in making these nominations to take into consideration the claims of depressed and unrepresented communities. There is not one board to which a Muhammadan or a member of the depressed class has not been nominated. The real difficulty is there are more applicants than there are places. My friend the hon. the Mover, for instance, applied for a place on the Chittoor District Board and much against my will I could not comply with the request, as there was no place available."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"May I, Sir, explain that it is a most unfair statement to make? The hon. the Chief Minister soon after I reached Chittoor told me that it would be advisable if I should get nominated and that he would give me the very first nomination. That was over two years ago."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"Well, Sir, he wanted to be nominated and the Government could not find a place for him."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I most emphatically deny it and, as a matter of fact, the hon. Minister said at Ootacamund that he could not appoint me. I did not pay the slightest attention to it. I could always enter by the front door."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Do I understand the hon. Member to say that the Hon. Minister told him that he could not give him a nomination?"

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I did not ask him for any nomination or appointment, honorary or paid."

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [27th November 1923]

“The hon. Mr. Patro in spite of his 1½ hours’ speech has not been able to show any useful work which this Ministry has been able to do. He said that the circumstances were such that they were not able to do much. The House was prepared to support them and still we must say that the whole of the record of the Ministry is practically zero.”

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—“Mr. President, Sir, when I first read the motion tabled by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, 2-45 p.m. I thought it was a motion which called for a searching of one’s political conscience and for an examination of the political principles to which one adheres. Now, these are things that cannot be put on or put off like one’s dress. They are so much a part of oneself that something more than a mere sentimental objection to a policy or programme, some great dereliction of duty, or some serious objection is necessary to justify a thorough change of political views. I have kept an open mind. I have been all attention to what was said by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, and the other hon. Members who have supported him. I have been looking for some clear, definite policy, general political programme, but beyond a vehement reiteration of some constructive charges that the policy to which the Ministry has been pledged is not sufficiently democratic or progressive, I fail to see any very serious charges, any grave political or economic blunders, such as would justify the moving of a No-confidence resolution. Speaking for the minority which I represent, the main reason why the minority has adhered to the political programme of the Ministerialists is that the Ministerialists stand for the progressive political evolution of this country in co-operation with the Government, crediting them with honesty of intention and purpose, putting faith in the Montague-Chelmsford reforms and regarding them as marking an important stage in well-ordered progress towards Self-Government. That is a programme that appeals to the minorities. It is most practical and business like that one should take existing institutions, the Government which obtains, and by adjustments or by adaptations to new requirements, to new political aspirations, to the growing fitness of the people and to the growing demands made by new democratic ideas and ideals for evolving a new Government without doing violence to the old.

“Side by side with this political programme there is another which is equally important, namely, the economic policy for promoting the prosperity of this province: that encouragement should be given to industries, indigenous industries, and nascent industries, that new industries should be started for which the province is fit and for which there is abundant raw material, that facilities should be afforded for research work, that the talents of Indian youths should be fostered for industrial, technical and commercial pursuits, that their minds should be diverted from purely literary or academic callings into new walks of life which would enable them to contribute more and more to the economic prosperity of this province and also to solve the question of unemployment or of unproductive or unremunerative employments. For this reason I should think that the State Aid to Industries Bill which was passed by this House was a right step in the right direction. This measure, if properly worked out, would certainly result in the economic salvation of this province.

“There is also another point which appeals to minorities. The Ministry is working for the elevation of the politically and socially backward classes.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
REGARDING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE MINISTRY

151

28th November 1923]

Ayes—cont.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 12. Mr. M. Gangarazu. | 28. Mr. B. Venkataratnam. |
| 13. „ P. Peddaraju. | 29. „ J. A. Saldanha. |
| 14. „ M. Sitayya. | 30. Dr. P. Subbarayan. |
| 15. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 31. Mr. Abbas Ali Khan. |
| 16. „ Sami Venkatachala Chettiyar. | 32. „ Haji Abdulla Sahib. |
| 17. „ P. C. Venkatapati Raju. | 33. „ T. N. Muhammad Sahib. |
| 18. „ A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. | 34. „ Abdulla Ghattala Sahib. |
| 19. „ P. Siva Rao. | 35. „ V. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar. |
| 20. „ T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 36. „ Abdul Hye Sahib. |
| 21. „ C. Gopala Menon. | 37. P. Khalifullah Sahib, Khan Bahadur. |
| 22. „ C. Maruthavanam Pillai. | 38. Mr. T. M. Moidu Sahib. |
| 23. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. | 39. „ Muhammad Moosa Sait. |
| 24. Mr. G. Rameswara Rao. | 40. „ Abdul Razaaq Sahib. |
| 25. „ S. Satyamurti. | 41. „ K. Uppi Sahib. |
| 26. „ M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 42. „ Abdul Wahab Sahib. |
| 27. „ Venkataramana Ayyar <i>alias</i>
V. Pantulu Ayyar. | 43. „ Yahya Ali Sahib. |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 33. Hony. Lt. Madurai. |
| 2. „ the Raja of Panagal. | 34. Mr. T. N. Marthandam Pillai. |
| 3. „ Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 35. „ B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 4. „ Mr. A. R. Knapp. | 36. „ A. M. M. Murugappa Chettiyar. |
| 5. „ Mr. C. P. Ramaswami
Ayyar. | 37. „ C. Muttayya Mudaliyar. |
| 6. „ Diwan Bahadur T. N. Siva-
gnanam Pillai. | 38. „ P. C. Muttu Chettiyar. |
| 7. Mr. E. W. Legh. | 39. „ O. M. Narayanan Nambudripad. |
| 8. „ C. Madhavan Nayar. | 40. „ B. Obalesappa. |
| 9. Dr. John Mathai. | 41. „ C. Ponnuswami Nayudu. |
| 10. Mr. P. L. Moore. | 42. „ K. S. Ponnuswami Pillai. |
| 11. „ G. F. Paddison. | 43. „ K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 12. „ C. R. T. Congreve. | 44. „ G. Premayya. |
| 13. „ J. A. Davis. | 45. „ P. T. Rajan. |
| 14. „ A. J. Leech. | 46. „ P. S. Rajappa. |
| 15. „ C. Nicholson. | 47. „ B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 16. „ P. W. Partridge. | 48. „ K. V. Ramachari. |
| 17. „ A. E. Rencontre. | 49. P. Raman, Rao Bahadur. |
| 18. „ S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad. | 50. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 19. „ D. Appavu Chettiyar. | 51. The Raja of Ramnad. |
| 20. „ S. Arpudaswami Udayar. | 52. Mr. M. Ratnaswami. |
| 21. „ P. K. S. Arumuga Nadar. | 53. „ J. D. Samuel. |
| 22. „ A. V. Bhanoji Rao. | 54. „ K. Sarabha Reddi. |
| 23. „ N. Devendrudu. | 55. „ K. Sarvarayudu. |
| 24. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 56. „ K. Sitarama Reddi. |
| 25. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. | 57. „ R. Srinivasan. |
| 26. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu
Nayudu. | 58. „ Chavadi K. Subrahmanya Pillai. |
| 27. Mr. Cruz Fernandez. | 59. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayana-
murti Nayudu. |
| 28. „ P. Gopalan. | 60. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 29. „ Mahabala Hegde. | 61. Rao Bahadur O. Tanikachala Chetti-
yar. |
| 30. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 62. Mr. K. Venkatachala Padayachi. |
| 31. Rao Bahadur K. Krishnaswami
Nayudu. | 63. „ R. Virayyan. |
| 32. Mr. V. Madhava Raja. | 64. „ P. K. A. Ct. Virappa Chettiyar. |
| | 65. „ W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. |

Neutral.

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. H. Tireman. | 5. Mr. K. Raghuchandra Bellala. |
| 2. „ Ari Gowder. | 6. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. |
| 3. „ G. Mallesappa. | 7. Sir K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. |
| 4. Diwan Bahadur S. Rm. M. C.
T. Pethachi Chettiyar. | 8. Mr. P. Sagaram. |
| | 9. „ V. C. Vellingiri Gounder. |
| | 10. „ C. Venkataranga Reddi. |

Ayes: 43.

Noes: 65.

Neutral 10.

[28th November 1923]

The motion was declared lost.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" Sir, as to the result of the motion, may I request you to allow me to see how the elected Members have voted on the motion and to have the figures, if I may ? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The whole thing will appear in print in the proceedings to-morrow or the day after and the hon. Member can have the figures himself if he can wait a bit."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" I cheerfully obey the chair."

The Council adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. the next day.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

